

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY NEXT AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Thursday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, following disposition of the conventions, it is the intention of the leadership to bring up H.R. 16911, the so-called special drawing rights, which measure was reported unanimously from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate today, I move under the order previously entered, that the Sen-

ate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Thursday morning next.

Before any action is taken on my motion, I urge that the committees make use of the extra time.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, June 6, 1968, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 4, 1968:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A. Everette MacIntyre, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1968 (reappointment).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 15TH UNIVERSAL COTTON STANDARDS CONFERENCE

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the U.S. Department of Agriculture for a job well done in successfully conducting the recent 15th Universal Cotton Standards Conference in Memphis, Tenn.

As many of you probably know, the purpose of the conference, which is held every 3 years by USDA's Consumer and Marketing Service, is to approve key sets of the universal cotton standards for American upland cotton. The conference is held under terms of the Universal Cotton Standards Agreement, which was put into effect in 1923, and now includes 13 signatory cotton associations located in Belgium, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, and the United Kingdom. Delegates from these associations, as well as representatives from the U.S. cotton industry—including ginners, producers, shippers, and manufacturers—were at the meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that these conferences—this is the 15th—are outstanding examples of international cooperation and teamwork to be observed anywhere.

Moreover, the universal cotton standards for American upland cotton are the first international standards to be adopted and put into use in trading between nations.

The Codex Alimentarius, sponsored by the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, is now working toward world standards for food, but I must say that the cotton people are about 45 years ahead of them.

The 1968 conference went very smoothly and 100 key sets of standards—each set made up of 15 boxes of samples representing the physical grades of American upland cotton—were approved in only 2 days. This was possible, of course, only because of the many

months of hard work performed by the C. & M.S. Cotton Division in advance of the conference.

Preparation for the conference began last fall, when the Cotton Division purchased bales of cotton suitable for preparing the 100 key sets of the standards. Then, in January, special classing experts were brought into Memphis from all across the Cotton Belt to make special adjustments in the key copies so they would match the previous set of standards, approved at the 1965 conference, as closely as possible.

By using the universal standards, cotton merchants and manufacturers in Japan, India, England, Germany, or any other country can state exactly what quality of cotton they want to buy and know that the seller understands their specifications. Middling white cotton means the same thing to each of them, because each understands and uses this previously agreed upon standard to describe this particular quality of cotton.

Much of the success of this standards program has been due to the meticulous care exercised by the Consumer and Marketing Service in reproducing the thousands of standards that are distributed throughout the world each year.

I would like to add my congratulations to the many others received at the recently concluded conference for a job well done.

"JOB FAIR" IN HOUSTON—POSITIVE ACTION BY BUSINESSMEN AND YOUTH

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the businessmen and municipal employers of Houston, Tex., are to be congratulated for the farsighted arrangements to employ city youths during the upcoming summer months. Billed as the second annual Job Fair, recruiters and agents for over 300 companies met at the Houston Coliseum and interviewed ghetto kids

for summer jobs. The companies represented offered the city youth over 3,200 jobs. In 2 days of interviews, 2,300 Houston youths landed jobs. An estimated three-quarters of the applicants were Negroes and a vast majority were poor children from the ghetto.

Such endeavors as these are positive examples of what businessmen and concerned citizens in large urban centers can do to utilize the productive talents of our Nation's youth. We all benefit from such constructive alliances between business leaders and young people to help alleviate some of the economic problems in our Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Job Fair," published in Newsweek for May 27, 1968, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYMENT: THE JOB FAIR

Armstrong Ulysses, a 19-year-old high-school senior in Houston, tore into a big lunch last week—club sandwich, peach cobbler, milk shake and a sundae. He was celebrating, and with reason. He had just snagged a \$3.76-an-hour summer job as night warehouseman for Red Ball Motor Freight. "I figured it would pay something like \$1.60 to \$2," he bubbled. "But when he said \$3.76, my eyes like to pop out of my head."

"He" was a Red Ball recruiter, who with agents for 346 other employers was interviewing ghetto kids for summer jobs at Houston's Coliseum. It was the city's second "job fair," an attempt to head off trouble of the kind that shook predominantly Negro Texas Southern University last spring and awakened the city to the fact that many of its 350,000 Negroes were without jobs.

At the first fair last year, nearly 1,000 youths got jobs with 216 companies, despite a late midsummer start. But this year, everything was different. Planning began months ago when a committee of municipal employees and businessmen made bold and repeated contacts with almost all the city's business firms, urging them to set aside summer jobs for ghetto kids or create jobs if necessary, at the minimum ratio of one for every 100 employees. If jobs weren't available, companies were pressed into donating up to \$768—average pay for a summer—so a kid could work in a hospital or other organization that couldn't afford the salary.

PUBLICITY

Ghetto schools were canvassed for job-seekers, who completed applications listing

the skills and financial conditions of their families. (Officials stipulated that an applicant's family must not have an annual income exceeding \$3,200, the Federal government's official poverty figure.) A publicity campaign was launched, including a television promotion the night before the fair opened. Off the Coliseum floor (where pro basketball and hockey teams play) a room was stuffed with twenty rows of picnic tables for interviewing.

The effort paid off—with the kind of big Texas likes. Scrubbed and shining, a total of 7,994 kids showed up at the two-day fair. Employers were there with a whopping 3,250 jobs—most in \$1.40- to \$1.80-an-hour service categories. Applicants milled around the interviewing tables, sipping free Cokes, hopping between employers, chatting, laughing. They were shrewd enough to duck 85-cent-an-hour kitchen helper jobs until the very last. But there were wistful sighs over the \$3.76 Red Ball jobs (the company handed out twenty such positions). A girl beamed about the salesclerk job she just landed with Montgomery Ward: "I'm really going to like it. I only wish there were more jobs so that everyone could be as happy as I am."

SNAGS

Along the way, there were snags. About 1,500 applicants were turned away either because they were too young, too old or had dropped out of school. The fair wasn't intended for dropouts—one way, officials reasoned, of encouraging kids to stay in school. About 450 jobs went unfilled. They required youths 18 to 22, who, because they were draft prospects or were already working, turned out in small numbers.

But when it was all over, weary officials pronounced the fair a success. They estimated that 75 per cent of the applicants were Negroes and that the vast majority of those were poor kids from ghettos. Businesses that couldn't supply jobs coughed up \$70,000—enough for about 90 jobs in hospitals or recreation areas. And everyone was pleased with the fair's most important statistic: in a scant 48 hours, 2,319 kids had landed jobs that they probably wouldn't have gotten otherwise. The total is expected to hit 3,000 by early summer, when several hundred post-fair jobs crop up.

CAMPING PERMIT ON THE MALL

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House may be interested in the following letter I received from Mrs. Jeanette Duncan of Brownwood, Tex., in which she inquires about a camping permit on the Mall here in Washington, the place now occupied by the so-called Resurrection City.

The letter follows:

BROWNWOOD, TEX.,

May 15, 1968.

Attention: Permit Department.
Re request for camping permit.

DIRECTOR,
National Park Service
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: For two summers now my children have wanted to visit in our national capital, but due to expensive accommodations it has always been beyond our finances. I was delighted to learn that you are now issuing camping permits for the area near the Lincoln and Washington Memorials bordering the Reflecting Pools. This will en-

able us to finally make our long awaited and hoped for trip to Washington, D.C. We enjoy camping out, and I believe we can borrow a tent from the Boy Scout troop at our church now that campsites are available and so convenient to downtown Washington.

I feel sure that you will want to be fair and impartial about this matter and will not discriminate against me because of my race (white). My party will be much smaller than the one that is currently arriving, and I can promise you that we will cause no trouble or disturbances whatsoever, as I am a strict believer in non-violence. Therefore, no troops will be needed for official duty; however, if you've got a single captain or major around who is not doing anything, it sure would be nice to have a guide.

Actually, I feel that my financial situation would justify my participation in the Poor People's March, but since many of us must work in order to pay the ever increasing social security and income taxes to provide the welfare programs demanded by these people who will not work, it will be impossible for me to get there in time to see Washington and be fed and housed at someone else's expense. I am a schoolteacher (with less than five year's experience), divorced, and the sole support of two children and myself. If you will check the pay for beginning teachers in Texas, you will see that it is not much above the \$3,000 poverty level. Therefore, I am sure that you can understand that the only way I could possibly afford a trip like this would be for us to be able to camp out.

I understand that the permit you have recently issued expires at 8:00 P.M. on June 16th, and I will not be able to come till the first week in August, so there should be no conflict in regard to timing. I would like to have a permit for the period of August 3-10, 1968. Anything in the area currently designated as "Resurrection City" will be just fine, and I know we will enjoy being so convenient to all the sights, especially the Capitol.

I would appreciate your arranging this and letting me hear from you at your earliest convenience so that I can make further plans. I feel it is high time some consideration is given to the wishes of the average, hard-working, law-abiding, tax-paying citizen for a change. I am sending copies of this letter to our two Texas senators and some of our congressmen, asking their help in seeing this matter through. I'm sure they would be anxious to see that none of their constituents are discriminated against because of race, color, or creed.

Thank you very much.

Yours truly,

Mrs. JEANETTE DUNCAN.

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA—VOICE FOR THE CONSUMER

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I commend the Consumer Federation of America on the resolutions adopted at its first annual meeting last month and congratulate the federation on the opening of its Washington office at 1012 14th Street, NW. Mrs. Erma Angevine is the executive director of this young organization, about which I am convinced we will hear a great deal from now on.

Consumer Federation of America—CFA—was proposed at the meeting of Consumer Assembly, sponsored by the National Consumers League, AFL-CIO,

and about 30 other organizations, in Washington last November. Consumer Assembly brought together representatives from the many local, State, and national consumer interest groups.

CFA now coordinates the work of about 56 of these consumer groups and will act as legal and research arm for the consumer movement, to represent before Congress and Federal agencies matters of consumer importance. It will also serve as a clearinghouse for consumer information.

The federation promises, I believe, to be the needed unifying force in the growing consumer movement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the resolutions adopted by Consumer Federation of America at its first annual meeting last month. The preamble outlines its purpose and enumerates the many areas in which more effective consumer protection is required.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1968 CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA—RESOLUTIONS PREAMBLE

Mindful that as we organize the Consumer Federation of America we are creating a force unique in our country's history, we resolve that the energy we mobilize through this new instrument shall be directed to achieve intelligent solutions for the consumer problems of all people.

Everyone is a consumer and the people's business is all-inclusive. But the particular problems which are the concern of the Consumer Federation of America, being specific, provide focus for our efforts. In order to include everyone our approach is necessarily non-partisan, and membership is open to all bona fide consumer organizations willing to associate with our program and work for the objectives we set for ourselves now and hereafter.

We pledge the efforts of Consumer Federation of America to assist local and state consumer organizations in building membership wherever possible, in providing information on state and local issues, and in assisting in consumer education.

Since correction of consumer complaints must sometimes take place through legislation to be secured in the political arena, the Federation will neither blunt its efforts nor dilute its effectiveness through a slavish refusal to use its strength where it will count.

The stakes go beyond protection from the quick buck artist unconcerned with consumer welfare, and has to do with a careful balancing of the right in a free economy to make money, against an ordering of priorities for all consumers that affect decisively the quality of life for everyone. Since the latter concern, important as it is, has been without an effective spokesman, it is to fill this need in the continuing debates of our democracy that the Consumer Federation of America addresses itself.

It is the purpose of the Consumer Federation of America to encourage development of such consumer-owned institutions, to secure the passage of such state and federal legislation and to work in all other practical ways for conditions in our country which will enable all people to meet their needs for all kinds of goods and services—especially those people whose needs are at present least adequately met.

Among such needs are:

Credit at reasonable fully-known, interest rates, and opportunity to save in and borrow from institutions of their own.

Good homes in good neighborhoods at costs middle and lower income families can afford.

High quality medical care, preventive as well as curative.

Good quality food at fair prices in full, understandable measure.

Adequate, fairly-priced insurance.

Electricity and other utility services at lowest practicable cost and in full reliable supply in both rural and urban areas.

Fertilizer feed, petroleum products and other agricultural in-puts of known quality and fair cost.

Full and useful education for all young people, taught by well-paid and adequate teaching staffs.

Employment at socially significant work for all family bread-winners.

This will be the ongoing business of the Consumer Federation of America until these needs have been met for all our people.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Consumer Federation of America reaffirms its support of the principles embodied in the following legislation to provide—

Full Consumer Credit Protection.
Electric Power Reliability.
Natural Gas Pipeline Safety.
Radiation Control for Health and Safety.
Fish and Poultry Inspection.
Auto Insurance Study and Investigation.
Deceptive Sales Regulation.
Effective Federal regulation of garnishment.
Establishment of a Federal Drug Compendium.
Door-to-Door Sales Regulation.
Effective Guarantees and Warranties.
Inter-governmental Utility Consumers Counsel.
National Info-Tag.
Investigation of Cost of Medical Care.
Investigation of Cost of Drugs.
Effective Consumer Representation at all Levels of Government.
Strengthened Air and Water Pollution Controls.
Protection of the Interest of the American people in their own natural resources with specific reference to oil shale deposits, and sites for development of hydroelectric power; and in the results of publicly financed research, development and construction with special reference to nuclear power.

Ways to strengthen and make more effective the anti-trust and anti-monopoly actions of all pertinent agencies of the federal and state governments.

CONSUMERS AND ELECTRICITY

Whereas, the cost of electricity is a significant factor in the budget of all consumers, and availability of an abundant and reliable supply of inexpensive electric power helps improve the standard of living of all

Whereas, electricity is a necessity in modern industrial society and is supplied under monopoly conditions, and both these facts make necessary full opportunity for public scrutiny of the charges and actions of utilities in supplying this service because most consumers cannot "shop around" in making power purchases, and

Whereas, the flow-through to consumers of cost reductions made possible by new technology and techniques can result in substantial benefits to electric users, e.g., a drop of 1/10 of a cent per kilowatt-hour would represent an annual savings for consumers of about \$1.3 billion in 1968;

Now, therefore, be it resolved: That the Consumer Federation of America supports legislation which will insure that all consumers will have a chance to realize the benefits of nuclear power, urges creation of consumers' councils at the Federal and State level to protect the interest of consumers in electric utility matters, endorses publicly-owned power projects as a means of creating a "yardstick of competition" to measure the cost of electricity, and backs efforts of the Federal Power Commission and others to insure increased reliability of our power supply

and urges the Congress to effectuate the "Recapture Clause" of the 50 year licenses on Federal Hydro sites.

ELECTRIC POWER RELIABILITY

Whereas, the electric consumer of the United States is entitled to reliable and continuous electric service at fair rates, and

Whereas, legislation is pending (in S. 1934 and others) to provide federal standards to insure reliability and prevent massive power blackouts such as those which darkened the New England states in 1965 and parts of the Missouri Basin in 1966, and

Whereas, the Investor-Owned Utility companies have opposed this legislation, and through a device which they purport to be a "National Electric Reliability Council" are attempting to subvert the purposes of S. 1934 and

Whereas, significant segments of the public and consumer owned electric systems have been excluded from this so-called "reliability council" of the power companies, and

Whereas, the consumers who are owners and members of their own electric systems are entitled to share in any reliability planning,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Consumer Federation of America oppose the subterfuge and the affront by the Investor-owned Utilities against true electric reliability in the total national interest, and

Be it further resolved, that CFA support legislation which would accomplish the purposes sought by S. 1934 and protect the interest of utility consumers everywhere.

UNIFORM CONSUMER CREDIT CODE

Whereas, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, has drafted a Uniform Consumer Credit Code, which purports to regulate nearly all consumer credit transactions and establish rates of charge; and

Whereas, the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, will be meeting in session in August 1968 for the purpose of finally adopting this credit code and there is great likelihood that the proposed draft will be adopted and promptly recommended to the legislatures of the several states for enactment, and

Whereas, the proposed code will in most instances establish credit charges far in excess of rates prevailing throughout the United States and also bestow the dignity of the law upon many credit practices which currently are repugnant to the consumer and should have been banned long ago from the market place, and

Whereas, the total outstanding consumer debt is constantly rising in every state and such higher rates and unconscionable practices proposed by the Uniform Consumer Credit Code will adversely affect virtually every citizen-consumer and unjustly burden many families already forced to rely upon credit to survive from day to day; and

Whereas, we view with alarm the possible deleterious effect upon consumers of some of the provisions in the proposed code; now therefore be it.

Resolved, that the delegates of the Consumer Federation of America, assembled in first annual session, on the 28th day of April in the year 1968, call upon the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws to postpone adoption of the draft proposal known as the Uniform Consumer Credit Code until Consumer Groups have had ample opportunity to present their recommendations; and be it further

Resolved, that the Consumer Federation of America transmit a copy of this resolution to all member organizations to alert them as to the threat of this proposed code in its present form to all consumer debtors and installment purchasers in their respective states and urge such organizations to con-

tact the Commissioners representing their states for the purpose of making the consumer interest known.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year I mailed questionnaires to my constituents in the First District of Massachusetts which I am proud to represent in the Congress of the United States.

My questionnaire covered a wide range of subjects from Vietnam to taxes and crime in the streets. I was able to reach households in one-third of the State, and the results have been extremely helpful to me.

The returns which I have received indicated not only an active interest in the topics covered, but also approval of my method of sampling public opinion. I was pleased and grateful that more than 8,000 persons took the time to reply, and in a great many cases my constituents expanded their views in letters dealing in detail with specific problems facing my congressional district and our country.

The results of my questionnaire have now been tabulated and analyzed, and I now insert the results in the RECORD.

I am taking this action so my colleagues in the House and the general public can also be informed on how my constituents feel about the issues I have covered in my questionnaire.

It is my intention to send these results to my district in a forthcoming newsletter so that my constituents, State and local legislators, educators, historians, students, and others, can know the opinions and feelings of their fellow citizens on the urgent and pressing affairs of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have found widespread approval of this method of direct contact with my constituents. And only through such contact can I know their feelings and thus represent them more effectively.

My questionnaire has afforded the people of my district the opportunity to express themselves at a particularly crucial time in our history. I would like to publicly congratulate them and to encourage them to continue the interest they have evidenced thus far.

Mr. Speaker, a presentation of the results of my questionnaire follows:

1. Which of the following explanations for our involvement in the war in Vietnam do you approve:

To prevent the spread of communism.....	3, 775
To protect the security of the United States	2, 628
There is no valid reason for our presence	2, 523
To protect the people of South Vietnam from alien rule.....	1, 778
To contain China.....	1, 103

It is American aggression..... 555
None of the above..... 370

Total responses..... 8, 145

2. Which of the following courses of action in Vietnam would you recommend?

Step up military pressures..... 2, 784
Gradually reduce military activities and withdraw troops..... 2, 426
Stop the bombing of North Vietnam..... 1, 278
Immediately withdraw U.S. troops..... 1, 029
None of the above..... 529
Hold military activities at present level..... 527

Total responses..... 8, 144

3. Do you favor enactment of the administration's tax proposals which would mean a 10-percent increase on the amount now paid in income taxes by individuals and corporations?

Yes..... 2, 551
No..... 3, 751
Undecided..... 1, 817

Total responses..... 8, 146

4. Do you believe that a tax increase must be accompanied by a further reduction in government spending in order to be effective?

Yes..... 5, 261
No..... 950
Undecided..... 1, 946

Total responses..... 8, 144

5. Would you support increased Government expenditures for domestic programs while paying for the war in Asia?

Yes..... 1, 567
No..... 4, 611
Undecided..... 1, 946

Total responses..... 8, 145

6. Regardless of your answer to the above questions, given today's circumstances, in which areas (if any), of Government spending would you impose reductions?

Space programs..... 3, 857
Public works..... 2, 298
Poverty program..... 2, 070
Urban rebuilding programs..... 1, 919
Defense..... 1, 522
Aid to education..... 861
Foreign aid..... 650
Water and air pollution..... 591
No reduction..... 344

Total responses..... 8, 145

7. Which of the following policies do you favor with respect to our relations with Russia and the countries of Eastern Europe?

Increased nonmilitary trade and other reciprocal steps toward closer relations..... 5, 670
A policy of minimum contact and relations with these countries..... 1, 639
Neither of the above..... 309

Total responses..... 8, 142

8. Legislation passed by the House of Representatives proposes to fight the rising rate of crime in this country by providing Federal grants to State and local governments for the development of programs to improve police, court, and correctional systems. Do you feel this is an effective way for the Federal Government to fight crime?

Yes..... 3, 434
No..... 840
Undecided..... 3, 809

Total responses..... 8, 145

9. What is your opinion regarding laws pertaining to privately owned arms, such as rifles, shotguns, pistols, and revolvers?

Present laws are not adequate for protection of the public..... 5, 206
Present laws are adequate for protection of the public..... 2, 318

Total responses..... 8, 145

10. If your answer to 9 above was that present laws are not adequate, please indicate any of the following additions to the law which you favor.

Prohibit purchase of such weapons through the mails..... 4, 747
Require that all persons owning such weapons be required to register them with State or local authorities..... 4, 468
Other..... 211

Total responses..... 8, 144

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON PROVES HIMSELF AS CREATIVE AND CONSTRUCTIVE LEADER DURING PERIOD OF MANY PROBLEMS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there are constructive achievements to be credited to the administration of President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Editorial comment is not always complimentary to our Chief Executive, but increasingly President Johnson has been given credit for worthwhile contributions in the public interest.

An assessment of President Johnson's record has recently been lauded by the Christian Science Monitor. The editorial of April 20, 1968, states:

L. B. J. set a record of social innovation that equals, if it does not surpass, that of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Extensions of Remarks the editorial in full, "L. B. J. in History."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

L. B. J. IN HISTORY

It must be soothing to President Johnson to see his prestige polls on the rise once again, and to discover at long last that he is commended by President de Gaulle, by the British press, and even by public opinion in draft-haven Sweden.

Thus quickly has opinion veered, as the President renounced a further term of office and launched the prospect of Vietnam peace by restricting American bombing of the North. With the mental blocks of partisan politics and a nagging war partially removed, Americans, and indeed people in far-off lands, are remembering that the Johnson years in the White House have been times of big accomplishment as well as sharp controversy.

President Johnson might also recall that not everyone, everywhere, opposed American policy in Vietnam. Certainly the Conservatives in Britain did not (nor did Prime Minister Harold Wilson). The West Germans were not generally hostile. And a whole string of countries in Asia either openly approved (Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia, Formosa, Singapore) or gave guarded assent

(Burma, India, Japan). Those glib phrases about the "whole world" being opposed to American policy in Vietnam were never accurate.

But it is on the domestic front that the Johnson record is strongest. To begin with, these were the years that were free of economic recession. The tax cut proposed by President Kennedy was pushed through Congress under President Johnson. After the tax slash of \$23.8 billion, there came a rise in total national output from \$605.8 billion annually to the current \$826 billion, though a portion of this reflects inflationary price trends.

President Johnson did more than any other president to bring about passage of strong civil-rights legislation. He further launched a Great Society program that was intended to boost living standards, rehabilitate cities, ensure equality among all citizens. The \$30-billion-a-year drain of Vietnam, with the President's attention focused on the war, allowed the drive to seep out of the "Great Society" effort.

Still, a great deal in the way of social legislation came to pass. Billions in federal aid went to schools and colleges. Medicare for persons over 65 and Medicaid for the "medically indigent" were launched. The Office of Economic Opportunity was set up as command post for the "war on poverty." Urban renewal money was quadrupled. Attacks on air and river pollution were begun. Two new Cabinet departments—Housing and Urban Development—and Transportation—were established.

On the other side, there are numerous liabilities on the Johnson ledger: unbalanced budgets, credibility gaps, sprawling bureaucracies, inflation. And the President has had much less influence with Congress since the Democratic election reverses of 1966. But LBJ set a record of social innovation that equals, if it does not surpass, that of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

A TRIBUTE IN THE NEWS TO A DOCTOR OF MEDICINE

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Henry G. Hadley is 74 years old. During the recent disturbances in the District of Columbia, Dr. Hadley ministered to injured riot victims, at the same time continuing his practice of making night calls to patients in their homes. Tuesday night last week, Dr. Hadley was attacked, robbed, and severely beaten while making such a call.

The account of this in last Thursday's Washington Post is a testimony to this man's courage and devotion to the oath of his profession. The Post reports that Dr. Hadley—within minutes after the brutal attack and robbery—insisted on returning to his patient with needed medicine.

The American people rarely have a problem obtaining the worst news about most anyone or anything, but the story of Dr. Hadley's courageous actions during the unfortunate crime committed is an inspiring reminder of a nobler heritage.

My family and I have been privileged, for more than a score of years, to have

the care of two physicians with similar ideals and character—Dr. A. Magruder MacDonald here in Washington, and Dr. Carson L. Oglesbee, in Muskogee, Okla. It is a wonderful feeling to know the dedication of such men who willingly forgo their own comfort and safety for the care of their patients.

Dr. Albert Schweitzer once wrote:

If men can be found who revolt against the spirit of thoughtlessness, and who are personalities sound enough and profound enough to let the ideals of ethical progress radiate from them as a force, there will start an activity of the spirit which will be strong enough to evoke a new mental and spiritual disposition in mankind.

Dr. Henry G. Hadley is such a man.

The article from the Washington Post follows:

STREET THUGS FELL DOCTOR ON SICK CALL
(By Alfred E. Lewis)

Dr. Henry G. Hadley, 74-year-old founder of the Southwest Washington hospital that bears his name, was robbed of \$200 Tuesday night and severely beaten by a gang of young street thugs.

The street attack felled the physician in the 1400 block of Fairmount st. n.w., about 10:30 p.m. in the midst of one of the frequent night sick calls he has made without incident for nearly half a century here.

The physician's wife said her husband had gone across town from his home at 4631 Nichols ave. sw., to the edge of the riot-wrecked Northwest Washington area to minister to a patient who had been in an auto accident.

He parked his car about 50 yards from the patient's home, but at the patient's bedside discovered he had left some medicine he needed in the car. Leaving his medical bag with the patient, Dr. Hadley was returning to his car when one teen-aged youth confronted him and another grabbed him from behind throwing him to the sidewalk.

"I was yelling for help all the time," Mrs. Hadley said her husband told her, "and when I saw three or four big youngsters running toward us, I thought we had them licked."

The new arrivals, however, turned out to be reinforcements for the thieves and began kicking him in the head and tearing his clothes as they emptied his pockets. In a few moments he was left lying bleeding from a head cut and semiconscious on the street. Someone called police and when they arrived, Dr. Hadley insisted on returning to his patient with the medicine he had gone to get.

Mrs. Hadley, who accompanied her husband to Hadley Memorial Hospital for first aid and then to their home nearby, said police recovered her husband's glasses but could not find his hearing aid. Both were dislodged in the struggle.

"I have tried to get him to cut down on these house calls," Mrs. Hadley said, "especially at night. I have also tried to get him to carry less money around with him. But he keeps saying he's so well known among the poorer people in this town, that nobody would want to hurt him."

Dr. Hadley himself dismissed his experience, saying "These youngsters would have beaten their own mothers, if they thought she was carrying something of value. All they wanted was the money. They had nothing against me."

Dr. Hadley, police recalled, was one of the city's few private physicians who ventured forth during the civil disturbances last month to minister where he could to the injured. In fair times and foul, he's been where's needed and Tuesday night's experience probably won't interrupt his schedule, one policeman predicted.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY FAVORING IMPORT QUOTAS ON EVAPORATED AND CONDENSED MILK

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, many persons in this country are concerned with the situation in the domestic evaporated and condensed milk industry as a result of competition from imported products. In South Carolina many jobs are provided for our citizens in evaporated and condensed milk processing plants. These jobs are threatened by the refusal of the administration to impose quotas on foreign imports which compete unfairly because of the cheap labor and lower standards in production facilities that are often found in other nations.

The South Carolina General Assembly has passed a concurrent resolution urging the Secretary of Agriculture to declare an emergency situation to exist in order to impose reasonable import quotas upon foreign evaporated and condensed milk.

Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

A concurrent resolution to urge the Secretary of Agriculture to declare an emergency situation to exist with regard to evaporated and condensed milk and take action to establish import quotas

Whereas, substantially all milk products are protected from unfair competition from foreign imports by Federal import quotas; and

Whereas, evaporated and condensed milk processing plants in this State provide an industry saving market for excess fluid milk and provide jobs for many of our citizens; and

Whereas, recent Federal action eliminating import quotas on evaporated and condensed milk has exposed this segment of the milk industry to massive and possibly destructive competition from foreign imports because of cheap labor and lower standards in production facilities; and

Whereas, any substantial reduction in the market for domestic producers resulting from a flood of cheap imported products would require increased Federal purchases to maintain milk prices. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the General Assembly by this resolution directed to the Secretary of Agriculture does urge the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville Freeman, to declare an emergency situation to exist which requires the immediate imposition of reasonable import quotas upon foreign evaporated and condensed milk.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation, to Secretary Freeman, and to the President of the United States.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

POSSIBLE STRIKE AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I advised the Members of this House of the possibility of a wildcat strike by employees of the Government Printing Office, not being urged by union leadership but being dictated by fear on the part of the employees of their safety in traveling to and from work.

At this point in the RECORD I include the full text of a statement made by Mr. Donald Taylor, of the Columbia Typographical Union, concerning the situation at GPO, as well as a statement of a victim of kidnaping and robbery this past Saturday, Mr. Virgil West, a linotype machinist at GPO.

The statements read as follows:

COLUMBIA TYPOGRAPHICAL
UNION NO. 101,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1968.

At the request of President Johnson, Mayor Walter Washington along with other City officials including Public Safety Director Patrick Murphy and Police Chief John Layton met with Vice President Donald C. Taylor of the Typographical Union for a two hour session in the Mayor's office yesterday afternoon concerning the safety of the GPO employees while going to and from work.

According to Mr. Taylor, who is Acting President of the Printer's Union, the 5,000 craftsmen of the 13 crafts employed at the Government Printing Office have united in an effort to obtain safe streets to enable their members to travel to and from work without fear from assault, robbery, etc. The Union has petitioned Members of Congress as well as the White House for assistance as they feel that a wildcat strike is a real possibility if crime committed against their members is not brought to a halt. This would, in effect, stop publication of the Congressional Record and other printing for the Congress.

It was brought out in the meeting that the GPO is losing printers faster than the Public Printer can recruit them, even though he is advertising Nation-wide for additional printers. In a questionnaire sent to former employees of the GPO, 50% listed that conditions in Washington, D.C. (and not the GPO itself) was their reason for resigning.

In answer to a question from the Mayor, it was brought out by Mr. Taylor that it was definitely not a racial problem as approximately one-third of the victims were Negroes. He also brought out that Public Printer James L. Harrison failed in his bid to have a new GPO built at Bolling Field due to City pressure for low-cost housing, then failed again for a proposed site at the National Training School site for the same reason. Both sites would have provided "protected" parking for GPO's employees. Only the top officials have parking furnished to them by the GPO now. Presently, the Public Printer is fighting to have the GPO moved to nearby Prince Georges County. However, Mayor Washington has come out against moving the GPO from the District, stating that he felt that employees who did not own cars would have difficulty in reaching the new plant which would be located at the intersection of the Beltway and Annapolis Freeway, which is approximately 4 miles from the District. However, Mr. Taylor pointed out that it would take 5 years to build and move into a

new plant and by that time the proposed subway system could have their proposed station built at that point. There are already tracks running out there on PRR's line. The fact that parking conditions as well as crime are bad in their present location and the fact that it seems we are unable to move leaves the future for the GPO employees pretty dark.

However, it appears that some progress was made in the Mayor's office as all concerned felt the meeting was productive and that there were many areas of agreement, such as an urgent need for a 2,000 car parking lot adjacent the GPO, and that steps would be taken to try and solve this problem immediately. There were other areas of agreement, but the Union Officer declined to elaborate as it involved police matters which he felt should not be publicized. However, within a few hours after this meeting yesterday, another GPO employee Mr. Joseph Urban of Bethesda, Md., was assaulted and robbed of his billfold containing \$5 while going to work on the night shift.

Ironically, while Vice President Taylor of the Printer's Union was assisting Mr. Urban, Mr. Taylor's wife received a phone call threatening "that her husband would get it next, if he continued with the problems that others should handle." The Union Officer discounted it as a prank, however, it upset his wife to the point of her calling Officials involved.

DONALD TAYLOR,
Acting President.

STATEMENT OF VIRGIL WEST, LINOTYPE MACHINIST

On Saturday morning, June 1, 1968, at 3:35 a.m., after leaving from work, I got in my car which was parked on H Street between North Capitol and 1st Street, NW. I got the car started and started to drive home. When a voice in the back seat said, "Keep straight ahead. I have a gun in your back." I did exactly as he told me. We went over the Memorial Bridge and that is about the only place I remember as I was instructed to take various turns and back roads that I was not familiar with or had ever been over before, when he ordered me to stop he told me to hand over my wallet. I asked him to take the money but please give me my wallet back with all my cards, license, registration card, etc., which he did.

I never at any time saw the man or pistol but felt the cold metal on the back of my neck continuously (and still feel it). By side glance only did I recognize him to be a negro with a brown hat and tan jacket. I could not identify him if he were to come and speak to me now.

I was tired and exhausted after a full night's work and the excitement of the ordeal of the past 45 minutes or so and did not report it thinking from past experience "what's the use anyway". They won't or can't do anything about it. Thinking if they do catch him it would be more trouble to me and cost me more time in lost work, and money than it would him even if he were prosecuted before the court. After seriously thinking this over, I decided to make the above statement in hopes that it might encourage my co-workers to be more alert when approaching their autos.

VIRGIL WEST.

CIVIL ENGINEERING IN THE FUTURE

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. President, there has recently come to my attention an

address by Thomas M. Lowe, Jr., vice president of a consulting engineers firm in Atlanta, that was delivered recently to a group of students and engineers at West Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Montgomery, W. Va.

Mr. Lowe entitled his address "Civil Engineering in the Future," but it might well have been entitled "The Future of America." He discussed in eloquent and forceful terms some of the drastic social and economic changes that are taking place in the United States today, as well as the role of civil engineering in the resolution of the critical problems that confront our country today and those that are to come in the years ahead. Mr. Lowe is to be commended for his insight and understanding. I commend his address to the attention of the Senate, and ask that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL ENGINEERING IN THE FUTURE

One of the most fascinating things about the future is its uncertainty. Predictions regarding these uncertainties are especially hazardous in the face of present day unrest, dissatisfaction, discontent, mistrust, violence, crime and a revulsive contempt for almost everything from the accepted to the sacred. Hopefully this tirade applies to a relatively small segment of our population, nevertheless it brings up the question—how many bad apples does it take to make a bad barrel? The answer depends on how the apple barrel is handled. The resolution of this question may determine the status of "Civil Engineering in the Future".

All prior civilizations have risen and fallen, most of them through violence. Nothing in recorded history justifies us in believing that our present civilization is indestructible. I am prepared to believe that history may not only repeat itself, but that it may do so at jet or orbital speed. Unless we can shift the emphasis from the common man to the uncommon man, I predict a dreary future for the human race. The great benefactors of mankind, while too numerous and controversial to mention here, constitute an insignificant figure when expressed as a percentage of the total. When measured in terms of their impact on human progress, they probably have made for us the difference between the Stone Age and the Space Age.

We are now on the verge of creating a world so complex and involved as to confuse, confound, and frustrate the average individual. If present trends persist this condition will engulf an ever increasing percentage of our people. Unless we stem the tide of moral decay and re-establish the dignity and self reliance of the individual, chaos is inevitable. Some seem to think that in numbers there is safety and immunity. Present trends indicate if enough people are involved in a crime or an outrage, all sense of individual responsibility approaches the vanishing point. This is a dangerous philosophy for an individual, much less a nation.

The engineers definitely are not in control. Don't quote me but there may be a big civil engineering job coming up—that of rebuilding civilization. Bobo may be getting ready to play with matches again, or Nero may be tuning his fiddle for another concert, or history may be preparing to repeat.

A comparison of the great depression of the 30's with the unprecedented prosperity of the 60's is a sad reflection indeed. We reacted magnificently in the face of adversity and deprivation, but have put on a rather poor show in the midst of plenty. Democracy is on trial. Have we given it a fair chance? What will the judgment of history be? Can

it survive the onslaughts of the growing ranks of the selfish, the arrogant and the unintelligent? What is the politician doing in this hour of decision? What are we doing?

I hope you will forgive me for this digression but let's hope that it will at least remind the engineers that not all the answers are to be found on the slide rule or by substitution in a formula.

In the preparation for the following remarks I concluded that a brief review of the history of Civil Engineering might help to point the way to the future.

The art of engineering originated with the Military. Its success was so significant that applications to civil works soon sprang up. Hence the name "civil" engineer. They were instrumental in promoting most of the early civilizations and there is abundant evidence of their valuable contributions to the welfare of the people. After many centuries of ups and downs, the civil engineers with notable assists from mathematicians, astronomers, and scientists laid the foundation for the application of these sciences to the orderly development of useful construction. This story is well told in the "Ancient Engineers" by L. Sprague DeCamp. It is a fascinating, factual account of engineers from the dawn of history to about the seventeenth century. I commend this book to you. In addition to its historical value, it contains delightful sidelights on the foibles and frailty of humanity, plus some enjoyable wit. The 18th and 19th centuries witnessed the accelerated emergence of the engineer as a leader in the march of civilization.

In 1852, the American Society of Civil Engineers was founded by a small group of engineers in New York City. In 1953, I attended the first Centennial Celebration of this important event in the history of civil engineering. About one hundred notable society members contributed articles to the 1953 Centennial Volume of the Transactions. This volume is one of my most prized books and I recommend it to you as a splendid history of civil engineering during the last half of the 19th and first half of the 20th Century. The period from 1952 to date eloquently speaks for itself. The civil engineer has at last firmly established his position in modern society.

Numbered among the outstanding civil engineering achievements since 1952 are: The Interstate Highway System, Urban Freeway Systems, The St. Lawrence Seaway, numerous monumental Skyscrapers, Sports Arenas, Coliseums, Airports, Bridges, Tunnels, Subways, Water Supply and Recreational Facilities, Sea Terminals and a host of other projects.

Now for a guess at what the future holds for the civil engineer. At this point my crystal ball gets a little fuzzy. We need to pause and take stock of who we are, where we are going, what we have, what can be done with it, and whom we can get to help us.

By far the most important and valuable item in our heritage chest is the Base of Scientific Knowledge which can either enhance or destroy our civilization. John King, the lowliest manual laborer in our midst today, is far more of a king than King John of a few centuries ago. He has more going for him and more potential back of him.

As a people we have shown tremendous dynamic power. We still have great latent power but its direction is wavering. What we need is an outbreak of common sense of epidemic proportions. This should clear the air and pave the way for a resumption of our march to a greater tomorrow. In this march the civil engineers will have to come to grips with the growing problems of environmental engineering, pollution of air and water, sewage and waste treatment plants, smog and solid wastes disposal, as well as a host of other highly complex and involved problems.

Transportation, especially in the urban areas, is critical and getting worse. The intelligent solution of decentralization has

been widely rejected. Other solutions in the field of civil engineering should provide civil engineers with a challenge for several decades.

Water has always been a problem and bids fair to becoming critical in many areas. California is now in the midst of a mammoth program to store and transport to the south some of the surplus water of the northern part of the state. This is a long range multi-billion dollar project. Presently tagged with a 100 billion dollar estimated cost is a scheme to store and export the vast surplus of water in southern Alaska and western Canada, all the way to the southwestern part of the United States, Texas, and northern Mexico and even to the Great Lakes Region. There is little danger of running out of work on this job.

The oceans are the last great frontiers on this planet. If properly managed they may produce food for the teeming millions predicted in the not too distant future. Superficial explorations indicate that they contain vast sources of valuable petroleum and minerals. Their depths are viewed as a refuge when thermo-nuclear war breaks out. Whole submerged cities are envisioned as survival areas. Science fiction is being converted into stark reality before our very eyes. Anything the imagination can conceive, the mind of a man may eventually contrive. The world is becoming so complicated and involved that the traditional consultant will give way to the highly sophisticated, computerized efforts of design teams. I am now making a careful study of the Duck Bill Platypus and the Dodo Bird with the view of joining their ranks. Obsolescence is a way of life—no one is immune. The fundamental law of nature is adapt or die. There is no reprieve. The engineers will have a lot of adapting to do, especially the older group.

NEGOTIATIONS: HOPES VERSUS REALITIES

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I believe that most of our colleagues are familiar with the good work being done by the Citizens Committee for Peace with Freedom in Vietnam. This is a nonprofit, nonpartisan group of concerned citizens who seek peace with freedom in Vietnam. It was founded in October 1967 by private citizens, including former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower and former Senator Paul H. Douglas.

All three of these statesmen and others on the committee have contributed a great deal to a clearer understanding of our objectives in Vietnam. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting a copy of their latest policy statement, "Negotiations: Hopes Versus Realities." This was prepared by a special committee of 14 members including General Eisenhower, who participated in the drafting up to just before his recent illness. I think that it gives a clear and concise picture of the present Paris negotiations, and should be read by all of our colleagues.

NEGOTIATIONS: HOPES VERSUS REALITIES

(Statement of the Special Committee on Negotiations of the Citizens Committee for Peace with Freedom in Vietnam)

The United States welcomes negotiations which offer a hope of peace with freedom and honor in Vietnam—a responsible and

endurable settlement of this long, bloody and costly war. But negotiations are merely a beginning to an end. And the end is not yet in sight.

The road to a negotiated settlement of the war in Vietnam is likely to be long and hard. It is likely to twist and turn and take agonizing detours. And we face the unhappy prospect of continued bloodshed. A cease-fire is more likely to come at the end than at the beginning of a negotiating process.

We should not be discouraged or deceived by rhetoric. It is not how Hanoi says something; it is what it says... and, more importantly, does.

Negotiations will be desirable if they lead to a mutual de-escalation of the conflict, and if they advance the prospect of achieving our minimum objectives. They will be dangerous and undesirable if they develop into a long drawn-out sequence of meaningless round-table discussions while our fighting men continue to pay, under conditions made more difficult by our restraint, a high daily toll of death and disability.

Negotiations will be insupportable if Hanoi escalates its military effort in the face of the reduction in ours. We must bear in mind that once negotiations begin, the pressure to continue them will be infinitely more insistent on us than on them. We are highly responsive to domestic and to world opinion; Hanoi is far less responsive to both.

OUR OBJECTIVES

Our minimum objectives in Vietnam must be kept clear and we must state them repeatedly and with precision. We seek the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack. Nothing could be simpler or clearer than that.

The South Vietnamese either freely choose their own government or they do not.

The aggression from the North either ends or it does not.

The North either takes over the South or it does not.

With this series of alternatives, it will not be difficult to know whether, and to what extent, we have succeeded or failed.

NEGOTIATIONS AND PEACE

There is no necessary equation between negotiations and peace. Negotiations are not an end in themselves—they are only a possible means to an end.

Regretfully, our Committee feels obliged to express its fear that many American citizens have been misled both by supporters and opponents of our commitment in Vietnam to place too high a value on negotiations or on "talks" in themselves—and to expect too much, too soon.

Americans think of negotiations as the road to peace but there is unmistakable evidence that Ho Chi Minh thinks of negotiations as another way to fight a war—in effect, as another weapons system. Too many Americans think the question is fight or negotiate. The enemy, on the other hand, has developed a consistent policy of fight and negotiate.

Hanoi's Deputy Chief of Staff, General Vinh, starkly enunciated this policy in a speech to the Fourth Congress of the Viet Cong: "We will take advantage of the opportunity offered by the negotiations to step up further our military attacks... the decisive factor lies on the battlefield. In fighting while negotiating, the side which fights more strongly will compel the adversary to accept its conditions."

PANMUNJOM EXPERIENCE

Our experience at Panmunjom is eloquent testimony to the enemy strategy and a clear warning to us. While Korean negotiations dragged on for two years—with an enemy

record of duplicity, deceit and deliberately abrogated agreements—we suffered 62,000 additional casualties with almost 13,000 dead. And there is yet no true peace in Korea.

We must adopt a realistic attitude toward negotiations, not allowing our hopes and our expectations to outrun harsh realities. Negotiations will be neither valuable nor productive unless both sides feel that it is in their interest to end the conflict and negotiate a settlement of the issues. Even though our military progress has been considerable, we cannot expect to win at the conference table what we have not won on the battlefield. Equally, we must avoid losing at the conference table what we have fought so hard, and given so much, to protect.

AMERICAN RESOLUTION

The pattern of negotiations will reflect the military, economic and political strength of the opposing forces in Vietnam. One of the greatest of these strengths is resolution—the determination to see the struggle through—and the communication of that determination to the enemy. We would be foolish to expect Hanoi to negotiate a mutually satisfactory settlement of the war if their leaders believe that the resolution of the United States and South Vietnam is failing. Thus, one of the greatest threats to successful negotiations is that Hanoi may underestimate America's resolve.

We must unceasingly make it clear to Hanoi that we do not seek nor will we accept a camouflaged surrender which would inevitably result in the United States "writing off" Southeast Asia for the foreseeable future. We could survive such a catastrophe—but our citizenry should be clear that the whole security system, which has maintained peace and freedom for the past generation, would be eroded—if not destroyed—by an American retreat from our commitments in Southeast Asia. We would become a relatively isolated and less influential nation. Further, our withdrawal would be followed by the massacre of hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese who have stood by our side. On moral grounds alone, this cannot be permitted.

TIME AND COST

Our opponents view the conflict as being fought in two principal areas—time and cost. They appear convinced that both factors are now working in their favor.

Time

America appears impatient to end the war. We think in terms of weeks and months. Hanoi thinks in terms of years and decades.²

Cost

We appear unwilling to pay the continuing costs of the conflict. They appear resigned to their proportionately far heavier costs, particularly in human casualties. To

delegations held 179 additional meetings. The Staff and Liaison officers met 427 times. In all, there were 765 meetings. The various sessions and meeting were recessed 20 times, once for 199 days. 966 hours were spent in face-to-face negotiations with the Communists. The transcript of the Armistice Conference comprises 3 bound volumes, each an inch and one-half thick. The records pertaining to the negotiations occupy 52 library boxes totaling 17 cubic feet.

² Mao Tse-tung long ago gave us, in his own words, a capsule definition of our opponents' consistent strategy:

"Enemies advance, we retreat

"Enemies halt, we harass

"Enemies tire, we attack

"Enemies retreat, we pursue."

The tactics vary; the strategy remains the same.

John K. Fairbank, America's noted Asian scholar, has said: "Ho Chi Minh and his colleagues are committed to permanent revolutionary struggle rather than to an interlude of war terminated by formal peace."

us an American life is above price; the enemy spends lives as we spend dollars.

In both areas—time and cost—impatience may indeed be our deadliest enemy.

If this is a reasonable analysis, the chances for productive negotiations would not appear to be substantial at this time. Hanoi's willingness to engage in genuine negotiations is, in our judgment, inversely related to their estimate of their military-political progress.

Nevertheless, America and its allies should painstakingly explore, for a reasonable time, every possible avenue of securing an honorable resolution of the conflict.

PEACE WITH FREEDOM

One cannot over-emphasize what we do not seek in Vietnam; we do not seek the surrender of North Vietnam or to destroy it or its people. Rather, we seek freedom for South Vietnam and an end of the aggression directed from the North. We fight for peace with freedom and honor.

We hope to see a South Vietnam which is free, united, independent, politically stable and economically expanding. To the degree that these longer range goals are attained, we will have achieved our "victory."

"Instant" victory is, unfortunately, not available to us on the battlefield or at the negotiating table. In both arenas, we must beware of impatience, disillusionment, and extremist and simplistic answers to complex problems. Particularly, if negotiations should break down, we must re-survey our position and weigh carefully the danger of over-reacting and of sharply escalating our military effort in search of a quick victory. Winning in Vietnam at the expense of losing our position in the world would be a Pyrrhic triumph.

America has, by its unilateral de-escalation of the conflict, demonstrated to the world our devotion to peace. It would now seem both prudent and warranted for us not to make further concessions without reciprocal, although not necessarily simultaneous, acts from the other side.

Mutual de-escalation is by definition a two-way street. Hanoi cannot always take and never give; always demand everything and never concede anything. A sequence of unilateral concessions by us, not reciprocated by Hanoi, would be the road to surrender.

COALITION GOVERNMENT

We believe there is one thing that the United States should not do. We should not exert pressure on South Vietnam to accept a coalition government.

Any representation of the National Liberation Front in the political structure of South Vietnam should occur as a result of a free political choice expressed by the South Vietnamese themselves. All citizens of South Vietnam can fully participate in the democratic process—on a one man-one vote basis—without the foreign imposition of a coalition government. History is replete with examples of Communist takeovers of governments by obtaining control of key ministries such as defense, justice, police and propaganda. Indeed, Czechoslovakia is only now emerging from twenty years of totalitarianism following a "coalition government."

A WORLD IN CONFLICT

Finally, America must not expect too much to flow from a resolution of the conflict in Vietnam. We live in a world of great antipathetic historical forces. There is no early prospect for world peace in the traditional sense. There is conflict in today's world and conflict—political, economic or even military—will unquestionably continue at various levels and in various places for the foreseeable future.

Our basic continuing objective is to hold such conflict within the bounds that permit the survival of mankind. That is why we adhere to our generous and farsighted policy—the willingness to fight a limited conflict, with limited means, at limited risk for limited objectives.

The success or failure of that policy may well be decisive in shaping not only the destiny of South Vietnam and of Southeast Asia but of the entire world.

Omar N. Bradley, Lucius D. Clay, James B. Conant, Paul H. Douglas, Roscoe Drummond, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John W. Hanes, Jr., Mary P. Lord, Archbishop Lucey, Franz Michael, Ithiel de Sola Pool, Leverett Saltonstall, Henry P. Van Dusen, Eugene P. Wigner.

ESSAY CONTEST CONDUCTED BY ROTARY CLUB OF WICHITA FALLS, TEX.

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Rotary Club of Wichita Falls, my hometown, recently conducted its "Americanism" essay contest among seniors in our city's high schools. Five young Texans were selected as winners from their respective schools.

I believe that the words of these young people will be of interest and inspiration to other Members of the Senate and to all patriotic Americans. I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO ME

(By Joe Vinson, Hirschi High School)

I am a young man just over eighteen years of age. Like all young men of this age, I think a great deal about our country and its commitments, especially military commitments. After a great deal of thought I came to the conclusion that I would indeed fight whenever and wherever I was needed in the service of my country. Many people would describe this decision as one of patriotism or nationalism or even refer to it sarcastically as heroism. I much prefer to describe it as an act of Americanism. This is what Americanism means to me; a combination of pride, love, devotion, and the willingness to serve one's country in any capacity of which one is capable. (The Armed Forces, although important, do not represent the only battlefield upon which a person can fight for their country.)

Pride is a feeling that is useless unless it is coupled with sincerity. A person who is sincere is indeed a proud person. Our country and its heritage is something for which every true American can feel a deep and sincere pride. To be able to stand up and proclaim to all the world that you are an American is a privilege far too great to be taken lightly. Whenever an individual is at a sporting event and the National Anthem is played and the Stars and Stripes are run up to the top of the flag pole and he feels a slight swell of the breast and a lump in his throat, then that individual is experiencing one of the most enjoyable emotions in life: pride in his country.

Love is an emotion similar to pride but different in the fact that it goes much deeper. Love for one's country is one of the deepest emotions that a person is capable of feeling. Little more can be said about this emotion; (either you have it or you do not), there is no in between. If indeed one loves their country, there will be little doubt of this in his own mind.

Devotion is the most difficult characteristic of Americanism. This is predominately due

to the fact that to be devoted to one's country, one must be prepared to stand beside her under any and all conditions. What is best for the nation as a whole must be the interest nearest the heart of the individual at all times. There must be a willingness to work for the conditions which will better the country to which one is devoted. Continual complaining, not constructive criticism, with no action to right the conditions is of no value whatsoever. A truly devoted person will do his best to better conditions within his country while at the same time proclaiming to the world at large that he stands behind her in whatever action she takes.

The last characteristic of Americanism is a direct result of the three previous characteristics; pride, love, and devotion. To be willing to serve one's country one must be proud, devoted, and feel a deep and sincere love for that country. The willingness to serve is one of the things that made this country the greatest nation in this universe. The willingness to fight and to die for one's country is one of the most important characteristics of Americanism.

At the very beginning of this paper I said that Americanism to me was a combination of pride, love, devotion, and willingness to serve. There is little doubt that other people will have different opinions. However, this is what Americanism means to me.

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO ME

(By John A. Grenspun, Notre Dame High School)

In the middle of nothing, a distant shore marks the boundary. Within, a great, massive, moving body of azure water stretches, flexes. A million grasping waves reach out, lapping sandy beaches. No driftwood is left alone in aimless oblivion. The water is drink for the thirsty, food for the hungry. This is the grand oasis, America. I have been here, have indulged; now, I am satisfied. This is America. This is mine.

What is America? What does being an American mean to me? I have found that being an American involves the ability to receive an honored way of life; then, simply, to live it. America is what I have and how I respond to what I have been given.

I have love and hate. My neighbor and I speak harsh words. Misguided fears and twisted prejudices cast a shadow of malice between us. But this is America, land of brotherhood and understanding. Across the barrier our hands clasp again; hate turns to love.

I have hope and despair. American dreams are shattered in seconds time. I am tempted to lash out at the motherland that bore me. But the overbearing hope, which is America to me, rebuilds those dreams and makes them real again.

I have faith and distrust. Often times I am confused and misled by false prophets who herald Americanism while actually hindering the very growth of that proud heritage. In such cases I can refer only to the principles upon which this nation was founded. Here the faith of our nation truly lies. This faith I will never lose.

I have war and peace. The conscience of my nation is troubled and shaken when it sends its sons to fight and die in far off battlefields. But the conscience of a nation is justified in fighting wars to liberate justice from tyranny and freedom from enslavement. So we have the peace of mind and spirit that comes to a nation that kills to stop the killing and dies to stop the dying. This also America has given to me.

America has given me other things, too. I have a sense of dedicated responsibility, the righteous duty imparted to every citizen who bears the most honorable of all titles—American. This, the responsibility to live by and for the heritage inherited by every American citizen. This, the duty to spread our heritage to peoples of other lands where freedom and

justice for all exists only in visions, not in reality.

I have two very wonderful parents who have raised three children the best way they know possible—the American way. For this I am proud and thankful. For a nation is just as strong and unified as the families that populate it. As the family goes, so goes the nation. In America, it goes well.

The sun shines. The waves are gentle, the water is calm. America, you have made me what I am. I am, now and forever, yours.

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO ME
(By Ladonna Hainline, S. H. Rider
High School)

"The Star Spangled Banner" rings out from the shiny instruments of a brass band marching smartly down the main street of a small town while the cheering, flag-waving crowd welcomes home a long awaited boy-soldier-hero. Joy pervades the atmosphere and a mother's heart is filled with pride and a secure peace. Elsewhere, a melancholy bugle mourning the Taps melody is punctuated by five guns firing in rapid succession. The American flag is reverently folded and received by a silent, proud mother. Grief is shown in the eyes of downcast mourners as the precious coffin lowers into the waiting earth.

Americanism is a heartfelt sensation experienced by all Americans—to some it is more personal than others. Sometimes it is taken for granted as an inherent right. It is easy to watch a flag being raised and allow a lump to occupy the throat with fierce pride when no sacrifice is required, but that is not Americanism, only security.

Americanism is patriotism and strength to stand behind our forefathers' democratic convictions at all times, not just when it is convenient. It is the determination to preserve our heritage. Our way of life is often thought to be an established fact written in history books that will stand forever true. This is a fallacy; our heritage was left to us to protect and nurture.

Americanism is a sense of pride, but not just pride. Sacrifice, awareness, and temperance are coupled with it. Since the Revolutionary War, Americans have sacrificed their most precious possessions—their sons, husbands, brothers, and lovers. This was shown in the first and second World Wars, the Korean conflict, and now Vietnam. When the cause was just, America could be counted on for support. Our country was aware of the need to remain united under one indivisible front. This has never been an easy task. There have been times when it would have been more convenient to follow a policy of noninvolvement in the face of another country's aggression. Instead, regardless of the displeasure an act might entail, the justice and determination so much a part of Americanism has overcome the temptation to rest on our laurels and let the world follow a disastrous course.

Where Americanism is concerned, no generation gap exists. Americanism is not encumbered by age or sex barriers. The younger generation falls in step with the older generation to insure their future. All have the opportunity to make history come alive and steer it toward the common goal of freedom; both generations share the burdens and pleasures of the American dream.

Americanism means many things. It is strength, pride, courage, determination, sacrifice, justice, and patriotism; but above all it is reality. Intangible and abstract, but within reach of those who seek it and appreciate it, Americanism is manifested in various ways—at celebrations or funerals, in peace or during war. It is not reserved only for times when America is favored by world opinion, but throughout troubled and trying times. Americanism is the end result of our ancestors' struggle for a cherished way of life.

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO ME
(By Paulette Williams, Booker T. Washington
High School)

To me, Americanism means the continued flow of good character, devotion of free men to the ideas of the United States of America, and consideration for the welfare of others. There are men so brave who die day after day only because their hearts and souls are instilled with strong support for this nation's traditions, customs, and beliefs. Men and women who remain at home reveal their devotion to America as they exercise those rights granted them in the Constitution of the United States of America; such that the same rights of their fellow citizens are not infringed upon. While Americanism includes respect for the rights of others, it also includes such things as respect for the laws of the United States of America, respect for its flag, and devotion to its ideas.

The historical background of America marks the foundation of what Americanism means to me. Several centuries after Christopher Columbus discovered America, the Puritans settled here in colonies seeking religious, economic, and political freedom and opportunity. Despite the many hardships, toils, and dangers of the colonists, they grew to be the united people of the United States of America. Years later great American men drew up the Supreme Law of the Land, which was the Constitution of the United States of America. This law states the justified rights and responsibilities of each American citizen. Other American documents such as the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights were formulated. Through the historical years of America, I see Americanism as freedom and opportunity determined by responsible men.

One of the most wonderful ways in which Americanism has been revealed to me is by the young American soldiers in Vietnam. These young men, who fight our enemy day after day, are thinking of their homeland. The fighting men in Vietnam are fighting for this country because they cherish its customs and ideas. In order that we maintain our great methods of living, such patriotic men are in combat with those who present threats to this land. It is therefore visual to me that Americanism is being exercised by our brave men who are fighting in Vietnam.

Americanism is also characterized by being concerned with the welfare of others. America has shown its good character by helping other countries. For years, since World War II, the United States has so generously supplied goods in grants and loans to underdeveloped nations. Most of these nations lacked education, good health, food, and military strength. With economic and military aid from the United States, many of these nations have improved tremendously. Today, India and the Republic of China have improved their living conditions. The people of Africa are doing much better in their development of their natural resources. These are just a few international relations which suggest to me that Americanism means being concerned with the welfare of others.

Americanism, to me, includes such things as showing good character, respect and devotion to the ideas of America, and consideration for the welfare of others. What Americanism means to me is best described in these words taken from the American Creed:

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country, to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

This is what Americanism means to me.

WHAT AMERICANISM MEANS TO ME
(By Nancey Carol Kohutek, Wichita Falls
High School)

To be an American is the greatest experi-

ence possible. Every door of opportunity and every potentiality of life is open to each American from his birth throughout his entire life. Regretfully, Americans have begun to lose the vitality and enthusiasm of their heritage as their Americanism wanes. Americanism—what a magical word! It exceeds the realm of most words in that it encompasses emotions, dreams, and challenges.

Emotions are felt by everyone. Many actions are direct results of emotions alone. An over-dose of emotionalism can be ineffective and unrealistic, but emotionalism in the right proportion is an absolute necessity to a well-rounded, dedicated American. Pride, of course, is the first mark of Americanism in an individual. Only through a proud heritage has America become the leading country of the world, and only through strong, proud Americans will it remain a pillar of freedom and a symbol of justice. Pride, though, is superficial unless it is reinforced by an unflinching, unequivocal love for America. Such a love overcomes injustice and criticism. It is true yet flexible. This emotion coupled with pride is the essence of Americanism, the foundation for a safe, growing country.

Americanism is much more than emotional, however. It is idealistic. Dreams emerge from the knowledge of a country where people rise from the lowest plane in life to ascend the throne of success and independence. Dreams for a better life for everyone are soon to develop in the minds of Americans. Eventually, youthful dreams become mature dreams for a better world and a happier life. These hopes, for they represent more than dreams, only continue because they are plausible and substantial in the realm of Americanism. These dreams can only be realized, though, if the challenges they create are met and successfully resolved.

Life for an American is full of challenges, but the idealism of loyal Americans increases the challenges for the present and the future. As always, there are world and political challenges but more pressing than those problems are domestic and personal challenges. Many people are involved in programs such as Head Start, Youth Corps, and various other training programs. They are meeting the challenges on the domestic field today. This is a sign of Americanism in action. Perhaps the greatest need today, though, is personal commitment. Every American must decide for himself that America is his country, a land of challenges and a land that needs the work of strong, capable people. This is realistic Americanism.

Thus, emotions, dreams, and challenges are involved in the mystical world of Americanism. It is a patient, thoughtful, exciting world that holds life and all its beauty within the reach of all Americans who will but take advantage of his birthright and background. Americanism is quite a word and quite an obligation!

**OIL IMPORT CONTROL PROGRAM
COSTS LESS THAN SUPPOSED**

HON. OMAR BURLESON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Clyde LaMotte, editor of the Oil and Gas Journal, run as a feature article in the Dallas Morning News, set the record straight on a recent editorial in the Washington Post regarding foreign oil imports:

OIL IMPORT CONTROL PROGRAM COSTS LESS THAN SUSPECTED

(By Clyde LaMotte)

WASHINGTON.—What does the oil import control program cost the public?

The Washington Post, one of the nation's most influential newspapers, claimed in a recent editorial that the cost to the U.S. public is "several billions of dollars a year" in higher prices for petroleum products.

To anyone at all familiar with the program, the Post statement is patently inaccurate and misleading.

The Post did not explain how it arrived at such a total. But it is obvious that it could be done only by eliminating all or most of the current domestic production and replacing it with lower cost Middle East crude oil.

The figure generally used as the difference between the cost of domestic crude and of Middle East crude delivered here is \$1.25 a barrel (3 cents a gallon). Thus, if all domestic production—amounting to about 3.2 billion barrels annually—were shut down to increase imports, the maximum "saving" in cost to the public would be about \$4 billion a year.

However, and the Post did not bother to mention this, there are many offsetting factors which change the "cost" picture greatly.

For example, Interior announced recently it had received high bids amounting to \$602 million in the May 21 offshore Texas lease sale. This, the agency reported, brought to \$1.7 billion the amount the Federal government has received on three offshore lease sales during the past 12 months.

Obviously, if domestic production were not allowed, there would be no offshore lease sales. So the \$4 billion "cost" figure is automatically reduced by \$1.7 billion, leaving \$2.3 billion.

In addition to the bonus money for leases, the Federal government receives rentals and one sixth of all the productions from an offshore lease. This is already amounting to many millions of dollars annually.

The Federal government also gets additional millions from leases and rentals of onshore public lands. This, too, would be lost if domestic production were halted.

State governments would lose several hundreds of millions of dollars annually which they now collect in oil and gas severance taxes.

State and federal governments would lose taxes on the income of producers, royalty owners and the 300,000 persons now employed in the exploration and production end of the industry.

Many inland refiners, having no access to foreign oil, would go out of business because, even if they were allowed to use domestic crude they could not compete with the importing companies using cheaper crude oil.

Also, because about 40 per cent of the nation's natural gas supply is produced in conjunction with oil, the shutting down of oil production would mean a loss of that much natural gas from the market. This would tend to force the price of natural gas upward to the public if, indeed, enough gas were available to meet consumer needs.

The balance of payments problem would be worsened by the purchase of an additional 3.2 billion barrels of oil abroad, and companies would step up their investments overseas in order to meet the increased demand.

The Gross National Product total would be reduced by almost \$10 billion by the loss of sales of domestic crude oil and natural gas.

All in all, then, it is obvious that the cost of "many billions of dollars" is far too high. At best, the direct and immediate net cost could hardly be more than \$1 billion and might well be considerably less.

A figure of \$1 billion a year, when applied to 3.2 billion barrels of oil would amount to a little over 31¢ a barrel—less than 1 cent a gallon. If the average motorist uses 700 gallons of gasoline a year, his "saving" by

using foreign oil would be a little over \$5 a year.

Even this saving would quickly disappear if foreign producing nations hiked their price of crude oil to serve a captive U.S. market, a very likely development.

Nevertheless, government oil officials take the view that there is at least an immediate, short-range cost resulting from the import program, although they do not put a price tag on it.

They justify the extra cost on the grounds of national security, pointing out that a strong, healthy domestic petroleum industry is essential. Congress and three different administrations have approved this approach.

But even though this has been explained time and again during the 9-year life of the program, the Washington Post specifically and the eastern press generally still haven't gotten the message.

The Post, in its editorial, said that "If the object of the policy is to enlarge domestic petroleum reserves in the event of an emergency, why not import much more of the low priced crude from the Persian Gulf?"

Evidently the Post has already forgotten about the Middle East crisis of last year which stopped the flow of 10 million barrels daily of oil from that region. This resulted in price increases of about 3 cents a gallon in Europe, which gets more than half of its oil from that source. But there was no increase of that sort in this country which, because of the import control program, receives only about 3 per cent of its oil from the Middle East. Nor was this nation's war effort adversely affected.

THE CHRISTIAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE STATE—SERMON BY REV. WINFIELD D. SMITH

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the relationship of the individual to the state and its laws has long been a question of great concern to religious leaders. On May 5, in the Episcopal Church of the Incarnation, Gaffney, S.C., the Reverend Winfield D. Smith delivered a fine sermon entitled "The Christian's Relationship to the State."

The Reverend Mr. Smith points out four reasons why Christians feel a moral obligation to obey the law. First, God has provided civilized government for our own good. Second, the state exists to maintain what is right and to put down what is wrong. Third, the state represents the authority of God on earth. Fourth, without obedience the state will cease to function. The Reverend Smith concludes by stating:

Take your place beside your local police and your elected representatives to secure and promote peace, temperance and morality, honesty and truthfulness, and justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the sermon be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHRISTIAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE STATE
(I Peter 2: 11, Romans 13: 1-6)

(Sermon by Rev. Winfield D. Smith, in the Episcopal Church of the Incarnation, Gaffney, S.C., May 5, 1968)

A portion of the Epistle for the Day reads:

"Submit yourselves to every human institution for the sake of the Lord, whether to the Sovereign as supreme, or to the governor as his deputy for the punishment of criminals and the commendation of those who do right. For it is the will of God that by your good conduct you should put ignorance and stupidity to silence."

The Apostle Peter wrote these words to small scattered groups of Christians living in the alien lands of Asia Minor. His letter is entitled: "The Calling of a Christian" in the New English Bible from which this translation is taken.

Shortly after Peter wrote this letter, Nero became ruler of Rome. It was Nero, you recall, who tried to wipe out Christianity, who subjected the first Christians to terrible persecution. Christians were an unlicensed cult, in the eyes of the State they were considered to be an off-shoot of Judaism. Then, too, Nero may have used Christians as a scapegoat for his own madness. They were, nonetheless, persecuted because they preferred to worship Jesus Christ as God, rather than Caesar. Some of them were bathed in oil, crucified, and set afire on posts to light the dark streets at night; some were wrapped in nets and thrown to wild animals to be clawed and pummeled to death. Yet, in spite of this fearful and oppressive state under which they would soon have to live, they were encouraged by Peter and instructed by Paul to submit to every human institution for the sake of the Lord. And, as a result, there isn't a shred of evidence anywhere that Christians were at anytime defiant toward civil authority, or rebellious, or lawless in their conduct toward the state, even Nero's. Instead, there are letters remaining written between provincial governors and Roman authorities which comment on the good conduct of the Christians brought to trial before them. They could find them guilty of no wrongdoing whatever except their unswerving commitment to worship Jesus Christ rather than Caesar. And, the Christians having chosen not to worship Caesar, and this being a capital crime, they were led off willingly and uncomplainingly to death.

Now, this relationship of a Christian to the State is an age old problem. The first Christians of the Apostle Peter's day had to wrestle with it. People down through the centuries have had to face it. And, today, you and I have to answer it.

For there is resistance, rebellion, and defiance abroad in our land. You and I have to explore this age old problem and arrive at some solution that we can live with. Being Christian, we have to begin with the teaching of Jesus and its application made by the New Testament saints, Peter and Paul. They had a larger knowledge of the One God and Father of us all; they had a clearer insight to Jesus' revelation of God's will than any or all Christians who have followed them. They would have been replaced during the past twenty critical centuries, if they had not understood the will of God for us in this important area.

These two great apostles believed that the "powers that be are ordained of God" (Romans 13); and that human institutions function most effectively when the people submit to them. It is a singular truth in the Judeo-Christian religions that God is in control of history, rather than men. "For there is no power but of God", Paul said to the Romans. And, this is one of the reasons that we should be careful to submit to every human institution; it is for the Lord's sake.

This morning, I want to zero in on one of these human institutions: the civil government.

I want to tell you four reasons why you and I must be obedient to the state

And, the first reason is this: God has provided civil government for our own good.

Now, this is not to say that dictators are provided by God. He permits them. Dictators are men who may have been called originally by God; but, of their own free will,

they have misused their power and have used their office for evil rather than for good. Many a warped personality in our time has claimed power by force and set himself up as a kind of god.

But, it is to say that government is the law of God. That is, "order is heaven's first law," as someone has said. Consider the first chapter of Genesis, for example.

God created this orderly, perfectly governed universe, which we take so much for granted, out of utter chaos. This universe can be understood by the simplest child in terms of the regular and dependable seasons of the year. The sun never fails to rise in the morning and set in the evening. We can calculate the time of sunrise and sunset in seconds for years ahead because we can depend on the universe to be orderly and regular. Spring follows winter; then comes summer and fall, with unchanging regularity which we can count on to survive.

Similarly, a society must have government. Without civil government, there would be chaos and anarchy. And, where there is no government in society, there is no security, no certainty of progress toward better things.

Therefore, God has provided in His Creation that there be human institutions with authority and leaders to rule with authority, so that there will not be chaos among men. Paul wrote: "the existing authorities are instituted by God."

The second reason why you and I must be obedient to the state is that the state exists to maintain what is right and to put down what is wrong. Or, as the Epistle says it: "for the punishment of criminals and the commendation of those who do right."

Civil government is necessary for the protection of life and property and for the keeping down of crime. And, how you and I feel toward the government will be determined by how effectively those in authority use their power for this purpose.

So, the rioter and the looter who disrespects authority and disregards property, and all others who wilfully defy the law, are actually being disobedient to God. The Law says: "Thou shalt not steal."

It is the responsibility, then, of those in authority to punish criminals as well as to commend those who do right. If the state upholds the right and puts down the wrong, it is being an obedient agent of God. If it does not do this, then, it is being disobedient to the Divine order, and the result is chaos, and a new government.

The third reason why you and I should be obedient to the state is that its leaders represent the authority of God on earth. Holy Scripture calls them the "ministers of God." That is, they fulfill a Divine vocation. And, like the priests in the Temple of old, they must be supported as servants of God. So, we gladly pay our taxes for good government. We submit to their authority because we recognize that all of them, whether they be presidents, cabinet officers, senators, representatives, judges, magistrates, jurymen, police,—they all serve by the authority of God.

It remains for the rest of us to accept the role of servant to this authority, not only because it is the prudent thing to do for the benefit of the common good, but because it is a matter of conscience placed on our hearts by God.

In a free society, such as ours, more than any other form of government, it seems to me, elected officials are called, cultivated, and groomed for office by God Himself for the special purpose of working out God's will for the world.

You remember the story of Joseph in the Old Testament. He was a spoiled child with a coat of many colors given him by an indulgent father; but, God led Joseph through one trial after another in Egypt and finally elevated him to be the savior of His starving people back in Canaan. It's a familiar story duplicated many times over in the history of man.

God calls leaders to positions of authority and requires us to be His obedient subjects. He expects us to honor and respect those in authority not because they are men in high office but because God's work can be discerned in their human efforts.

Our Church asks that every child learn the Ten Commandments by heart before he is confirmed. We rehearsed them today as we are instructed to do at least once monthly. The Fifth Commandment, the only Commandment with a promise, states: "Honor thy father and thy mother that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

The Church explains this Commandment, on page 288, of The Book of Common Prayer, to mean: "To love, honor, and help my father and mother: To honor and obey the civil authority: To submit myself to all my governors, teachers, spiritual pastors and masters: And to order myself in that lowliness and reverence which becometh a servant of God."

And, the Church's teaching hasn't gone out of date, either. It's been neglected.

The fourth reason why you and I should be obedient to the state is that without our obedience it could not function. Government would give place to anarchy just as Universities must close, unless authority placed in them is exercised as well as recognized.

God has appointed the law. Therefore, every Christian must uphold the law with an obedient and submissive spirit.

Now, this does not in any way mean to deny the right of conscience to protest against unjust actions of human institutions, nor to replace leaders in positions of authority when they abuse their powers. Yet, on the other hand, this does not permit the perverse and irresponsible defiance of authority so rampant in our nation today.

No law has the right to force any man's conscience. If any authority tries to enforce a law that sins against morality—that is, requires you to do what you know to be immoral—then, resistance to such a law is permissible at all costs. Nowhere does the Bible teach passive acceptance and non-resistance to immoral laws.

However, this is most important. Resistance to lawful authority must always be the last resort. Anyone who wishes to resist the authority of any human institution must be very careful that he is absolutely right. Otherwise, if he is not right, he will be setting up his own individual and personal judgment as the law of God.

We must continue to regard, and teach our children to have this regard, that subordination, rule, subjection, and loyalty are all part of the Divine order imposed upon all of us by the Lord God for the common good of us all.

Therefore, the Christian will always cooperate with the governing authorities. Take your place beside your local police and your elected representatives to secure and promote peace, temperance and morality, honesty and truthfulness, and justice.

For all of these things are necessary to our local and national well being. Government would be easy if every person serving there were a Christian; and, it would be good, if every Christian would realize his duties with respect to human institutions.

A good Christian can never be a bad subject; and, with piety in office, there can never be bad authority. Amen.

NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL SUPPORTS PERU AID CUTOFF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as everyone in this Chamber knows, I have been

deeply concerned about the sale of sophisticated weapons to less-developed countries who do not need them and cannot afford to waste their precious limited resources on these weapons of war. Recently the State Department put into effect for the first time, amendments which I sponsored, and cut off \$37.5 million in development loans which had been programed for Peru during fiscal 1968. This action was taken in response to Peru's purchase of over \$20 million worth of supersonic jet fighters from France.

An editorial in today's New York Times supports this action. In stating that "it is unreasonable to expect U.S. taxpayers to underwrite, directly or indirectly, Peru's military whims," the Times repeats one of the major reasons why I sponsored and fought for the adoption of these amendments.

Under unanimous consent I insert the full editorial at this point in the RECORD:

Direct arms aid is not the only vehicle through which the United States may become involved in undesirable weapons build-up. Sometimes nations receiving American economic assistance take advantage of this windfall to divert scarce domestic resources to military purchases.

To discourage this practice, Congress last year amended the foreign-aid appropriations bill to require a cut in economic assistance equal to the amount a developing nation spent on advanced weapons. This provision has led recently to the withholding of \$37.5-million in development loans from Peru, which has ordered more than \$20-million worth of supersonic jet fighter planes from France.

The Peruvians, as might be expected, are momentarily irate. Speaking caustically in an interview the other day, Premier Raul Ferrero Rebagliati said the United States would never be able to dictate policy to Peru.

Fair enough. But after passions have cooled, thoughtful Peruvians may come to realize that it is unreasonable to expect United States taxpayers to underwrite, directly or indirectly, Peru's military whims. This is especially true as long as Peru remains unwilling to tax adequately those of her own people who can afford it.

COOPERATIVE SUCCESS IN INDIA

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, several years of joint effort by cooperatives in India and the United States and the Governments of the two countries are resulting in a great new fertilizer in India. This is a success story upon which other enterprises can be based.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article about this project prepared by the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., which is located at 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVE FERTILIZER PLANT IN INDIA IS "ALL SYSTEMS GO"

Indian and U.S. cooperatives—assisted by private capital and a government guarantee—are working together to build a \$119 million nitrogen fertilizer plant in India.

The project is believed to be the world's largest international business transaction by cooperatives.

It has been in development for more than two years, but because of the complex and many-sided negotiations involved, only fragments of its story have heretofore been made public.

Parties to the project are: in India, the National Cooperative Union of India, the Indian government, Indian AID (U.S. Agency for International Development) Mission, Indian Farmers Fertilizer Cooperative, and other cooperatives; and in the United States, U.S. AID in Washington, the Bank of America, and some two dozen cooperative organizations.

For one of the principal participants, the Cooperative League of the USA, Chicago, the project marks a major fruition of 13 years of joint effort with the Indians to develop and strengthen cooperatives in their country. The League has maintained an office in New Delhi since 1955.

The Indian Farmers Fertilizer Cooperative, formed to own and operate the new plant and distribute its products, was inaugurated at a ceremony in New Delhi, April 11. Donald H. Thomas, president of Cooperative Fertilizers International of Chicago, new U.S. organization brought into being because of this project, was one of the speakers.

Following this inauguration, at which Jagjivan Ram, India's prime minister for food and agriculture, was the principal speaker, Thomas and Allie C. Felder, Jr., head of the Cooperative League India office, said that the project could be described as "all systems go."

The proposed plant will produce 1,000 tons of anhydrous ammonia (83% nitrogen) per day—an estimated (depending somewhat on formulas) 800,000 tons of finished fertilizer products a year.

One pound of nitrogen is computed to produce up to 10 pounds of additional wheat or rice. Thus, on the basis of 300 days' operation, this single plant could account for more than 80 million bushels of additional wheat or rice in a year.

This would mean a 3% to 5% increase in India's total annual grain production. It also is equivalent to nearly one-third of the wheat and feed grain the United States sent to India in 1967, peak year of its shipments under the "Food for Freedom" program.

The homemade fertilizer also will represent a saving of foreign exchange for India, which imports about \$400 million worth of fertilizer a year.

Of the estimated plant cost of \$119 million, 10% (\$12 million) is to come from the Indian cooperatives, 20% (\$24 million) from the Indian government in the form of redeemable stock, 23% (\$27 million) from the Indian government as a loan, and 47% (\$55 million) from a loan to be obtained in the United States.

The investment is projected to pay off in 12 years. In that time the plant will, according to computations, pay \$128 million in principal and interest; redeem the Indian government's \$24 million in shares and pay it \$12 million in dividends; save farmers \$165 million in cost of fertilizers; save the country \$350 million in foreign exchange, and represent a net worth of \$49 million. All of this is apart from the increased value of crop production resulting from the fertilizer.

Ram said in his April 11 speech that the plant is expected to reduce fertilizer prices from current levels by 10%, 20%, and 30% in its fourth, sixth, and eighth years of operation.

The plant will be built at Kandla, a port city on the Gulf of Kutch in northeast India. Construction is expected to begin in 1969, with completion targeted in 1971.

Development of this "India fertilizer project" is a many-stranded story.

In 1953 the American International Association for Economic and Social Development

(AIA)—founded by Nelson Rockefeller and active principally in Latin America—established a supervised agricultural credit project in India. The man in charge, Thomas B. Keehn, found himself working primarily with the Indian cooperatives.

In 1955 Jerry Voorhis, executive director of the Cooperative League from 1947 to 1967, made the League a partner with the AIA in the India project. Felder went to India for the League in 1956 as an agricultural credit specialist. In 1961 both Keehn and AIA left India and Felder took charge of the League's India office.

In 1961 Nationwide Insurance companies of Columbus, Ohio, a League member, sent a five-man team to India to study the possibilities of further assistance to cooperatives. This group recommended fertilizer production as part of an overall cooperative development plan.

In 1964 Howard A. Cowden, president of the 1-year-old International Cooperative Development Association, visited India and, as the result of talks with Indian co-op leaders, strongly recommended a fertilizer program.

Felder, working closely with the Indian co-op leaders, Indian government, and AID Mission, developed a comprehensive plan of cooperative development. The Indian government asked the Cooperative League to send a team to study the feasibility of the cooperative part of this plan.

On September 5, 1966, this team left for India, where it worked three months, returning in December.

The team members were Howard H. Gordon, retired general manager of Southern States Cooperative, Richmond, Va.; William Mitchell, manager of the plant food department of Tennessee Farmers Cooperative at LaVergne, Tenn.; and Albert J. Soday, process engineer of Mississippi Chemical Corporation, Yazoo City, Miss. Ferris S. Owen, administrator of AID projects for the Cooperative League, recruited the men; their trip was financed by the League's overseas-assistance contract with AID.

The team found the fertilizer project feasible and recommended a go-ahead.

At that point the Cooperative League referred the project to the International Cooperative Development Association, Washington, D.C., which had been formed by U.S. cooperatives in 1963 for the express purpose of promoting international cooperative business operations. Herbert C. Fledderjohn, who had succeeded Cowden as president of the ICDA, then took the lead in developing the plan, which ICDA's board approved in January, 1967.

A dramatic and perhaps decisive moment in development of the project came on January 19 at a meeting in the Jung hotel in New Orleans. ICDA called the meeting on short notice because representatives of most U.S. cooperatives in the fertilizer business were there for the annual meeting of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Fledderjohn presided. Kenneth F. Lundberg, president of the Central Farmers Fertilizer Company, Chicago, and Owen Cooper, president of Mississippi Chemical Corporation, both ICDA member organizations, presented the plan for a cooperative fertilizer plant in India.

One after another, on a rising wave of enthusiasm, the men present expressed themselves in favor of helping Indian farmers get a fertilizer plant. They left the meeting having pledged themselves to seek from their organizations \$1 million—not as invested capital expected to bring any return, but as a contribution to the costs of getting the plant going; travel to India, economic studies, and such.

In April Fledderjohn, Owen (who also had been on the 1961 Nationwide team), Lundberg, Cooper, and Gordon went to India to present the plan to the Indian cooperative and government. Felder and the India AID Mission were party to the talks.

The Indians liked what they heard, and on May 26 the government asked the ICDA, also a contractor with U.S. AID, to send a team of experts to get down to the brass tacks of plant location, type, size, and such. This team—Thomas, then an economic analyst for Central Farmers Fertilizer Company (which is owned by 22 fertilizer-producing co-ops in the United States and Canada); John Wiley, marketing specialist for Central Farmers; and Soday—worked in India six weeks in June and July.

On October 19 the Indian government formally accepted the plan, the cooperatives already having done so.

Meanwhile, on September 25 at a meeting in Washington the interested organizations had formed Cooperative Fertilizers International (CFI) to handle the U.S. side of the operation. CFI elected Thomas president and Lundberg chairman of the board. And during the summer the U.S. cooperatives had formally committed the \$1 million, to be paid in four equal parts over four years.

The Agency for International Development in Washington found that, because of cut-backs in funds, it could not lend the \$55 million needed to build the plant. It could, however, guarantee the loan; and on that basis a private lender was found: the Bank of America.

In April, 1968, CFI arranged for Ernest C. Davis, manager of the fertilizer plant of Central Nitrogen, Inc., at Terre Haute, Ind., to go "on loan" to India as its representative during the detailed planning and construction of the plant. He will work with Shri Paul Pothen, managing director of the plant.

Thomas, accompanied to India by O. Roy Wiebe, secretary-treasurer of Central Farmers, told his inauguration-day audience that the cooperative fertilizer plant will create "healthy competition" among plants in the private and public sectors of the industry, thereby benefiting all farmers.

In Chicago, Stanley Dreyer, president of the Cooperative League, described the India project as a wonderful example of cooperation among cooperatives—both within this country and between the two countries.

He said the League staff is proud of the part it has been able to play and is genuinely appreciative of the support of its own board and members as well as the cooperation of other organizations.

ZANZIBAR—AFRICA'S FIRST CUBA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the oppressed and captive black peoples of Communist-overrun Zanzibar can get no relief or action for their human rights from the people at the U.N.—a typical U.N. double standard.

It seems the Red-black bloc is only interested in attacking white people and not in aiding black people. Human rights at the United Nations must only mean "hate the whites."

Or perhaps the Communist bases for Russia, Cuba, and China in Zanzibar enslaving the black inhabitants are tolerated by the U.N. because they are part of a U.N. military invasion scheme—the Cuba of Africa.

I include several chapters from the book, "Zanzibar, Africa's First Cuba," and a letter from Ahmed Seif Kharusi, leader of the Zanzibar Organization, 68

Hudson Road, Southsea, Hampshire, England, as follows:

LIFE UNDER THE NEW COLONIALISTS

Since the appeal of the revolutionary regime was blatantly anti-Arab, recruitment into the present civil service depends on colour and not merit. Former Arab or Indian state employees have been thrown out of work; had their pensions cancelled and property seized. Some have been exiled. All these were Zanzibaris either by birth of naturalisation. The authorities have announced that they will allocate places in schools in proportion to the numbers of the various races in Zanzibar. In other words racial origin, rather than ability, has become the new criteria in education.

Land confiscated by the new regime has been handed over to the collective farms. These under Chinese administration have proved to be failures and the standard of living and amount of food available has declined steadily since "liberation."

The government itself consists of the Revolutionary Council which is unelected. It meets in secret and, therefore, its deliberations are not known. The only party allowed is the ASP as the UMMA party dissolved itself. Commenting on how this Commonwealth "government" conducts itself, Richard Beeston of the *Daily Telegraph* noted:

"This Council is the biggest stumbling block to establishing law and order on the island. The Central Government (on the mainland) has tried unsuccessfully to buy out the Council with a lump sum payment to each of its members. But many of them are reluctant to give up their positions of power and are afraid that once they lose their status they may be punished for crimes they have committed against civil population."

"Some of the members of the Council are moderate men but Zanzibar appears at present to be dominated by an extremist wing—the hard-core drunken thugs and gunmen who overthrew the Sultan's regime. These men were responsible for the recent waves of arrests, beatings-up and executions and the establishment of an illegal 'People's Liberation Army Court' which last week passed out five death sentences."

"Crimes continue to be perpetrated by members of the Revolutionary Council. These include floggings, rape, robbery and seizure of houses and private cars. Mr. Karume, who is himself a moderate is proving powerless to control his Revolutionary Council and although he enjoys considerable personal popularity, there have lately been signs that his grip is slipping."

The *Guardian* of 29 October 1966 carried a report from its correspondent in Dar-es-Salaam which revealed that:

"Under a decree published in Zanzibar today (28 October), the island authorities have set up a secret court to try political offenders—those detained in preventive detention and persons accused of theft or damage to Government property."

"No accused person will be allowed an advocate in the special court which is limited to 14 members under a decree signed by Mr. Karume, President of Zanzibar and Vice-President of Tanzania. The Court will lay down its own practice and procedure and will not be bound by the criminal procedure decree under which trials are normally heard on the island or by any other law."

"It will have power to pass death sentences and appeals against its decisions will go only to Mr. Karume. The Court has been legalised retroactively to 1 May, apparently to cover sentences imposed by the island's ruling Revolutionary Council."

Commenting on the rule of law in Zanzibar, the International Commission of Jurists observed:

¹ The *Daily Telegraph*, London, 23 November 1964.

"In April of the same year (1964) Tanganyika and Zanzibar united to form the United Republic of Tanzania with Julius Nyerere as President and Sheikh Karume as First Vice-President of the United Republic and President of Zanzibar. Little has in practice been done on the Zanzibar side to implement the Union as yet. Tanganyikans still do not, for example, have a free access to Zanzibar, and entry permits issued by the Minister of Home Affairs in Dar-es-Salaam are not necessarily accepted by the immigration authorities in Zanzibar. The Union, therefore, has apparently done little to modify developments in Zanzibar, or to open it up for outside visitors."

"In May 1965 a new constitution for the ASP was adopted with the approval of the Revolutionary Council. Under this constitution the Party is the supreme authority in the country, over and above the Revolutionary Council, and Ministers are responsible not to the Government but to the Party whose servants they are."

"The results of these innovations is to place the ASP in a position of supremacy unrivalled by that of any other single party. The whole governmental machine is built on and around the Party, and there appears to be no organ through which the voice of the citizen can be heard other than the Party institutions. The Party has not only been made the sole party: it has been consecrated as the organ of government, with power to dictate to the Revolutionary Council."

"Preventive detention was introduced by a decree published on 2 March 1964 by provisions which do not provide the safeguards considered necessary, even in a state of emergency, to ensure that the power of preventive detention is not abused. A detention order may be made by the President, for example, where it is deemed necessary to prevent any person from acting in a manner prejudicial to the defense and security of public order. The making of an order is entirely at the President's discretion, for his opinion that it is necessary is not open to any form of challenge: no order made under the decree can be questioned by any court, and orders can be made for an indefinite period of time."

"These sweeping powers were not taken merely for the period of unrest following the revolution, but appear to have been retained as part of the permanent legislation of Zanzibar . . . nine ministers in the former government are still in detention. Periodic efforts to secure their release have been in vain . . . The present number of detainees cannot be ascertained with certainty, though further arrests are reported to have been made for the last three years."

"On two occasions in November 1964 and May 1966, reports reached the outside world of waves of arrests following the discovery of plots to organise a counter-revolution. In each case allegations of wholesale arrests, interrogation and ill-treatment were made, allegations which it is impossible to substantiate or disprove in view of the Government's continued rigid censorship and refusal of entry to foreign correspondents. After the November 1964 arrests five men were sentenced to death and others to terms of five or ten years' imprisonment on charges of subversion arising out of an alleged ZNP plot . . . After the May 1966 arrests, five people were said to have been shot by government forces in Zanzibar and another five to have been buried alive on Pemba, but no confirmation of these reports has been possible."

"The almost complete silence which has been drawn over the events in Zanzibar since the revolution makes any valid assessment of the true situation there impossible. Certain conclusions can nevertheless be drawn from the meagre information available. In the first place it is indefensible that, over three years after the revolution, there should be no means by which the population can

participate in the affairs of their country. Not even lip-service is paid to the principle of representative government. Legislative power vested in the Revolutionary Council as an interim measure by a decree of March 1964, the legislative powers law, continues to be exercised by presidential decree. Representation of Zanzibar in the parliament of the United Republic continues to be by appointed members. It is time that the government of Zanzibar gave urgent attention to the re-introduction of representative institutions which will permit the people as a whole to have a voice in the running of their country and to express their views on what is done in their name and on their behalf."

"A second measure which the government of Zanzibar would be well advised to undertake would be the re-opening of its territory to foreign visitors and in particular to representatives of the press. The absence of reliable information about developments on the island for so long has inevitably given rise to rumours, some of which are probably more harmful to Zanzibar than the truth. Constructive criticism, the exposure of injustice and abuses, and comparison with other countries, as well as a true appreciation of achievements, can, and if accepted in the right spirit, often do have a beneficial effect upon a government anxious to promote the welfare of its people within the social structure it has chosen, and it is to be hoped that there are no reasons why the government of Zanzibar should continue to shield itself from such influences."

A spy mania still prevails in both Zanzibar and Pemba. Those who are known not to approve of the regime's policies are put into forced labour camps, and sometimes tortured. The number of political prisoners is estimated to be 2,000.

Such drastic policies have created chronic economic dislocation as has occurred in Cuba. Nationalised factories are producing less than before 1964; foreign currency is not available; even civil servants are not being paid and domestic consumer needs cannot be met. In the spring of 1966 food riots were reported to have taken place in both Zanzibar and Pemba. Today food is both expensive and scarce. The large number of citizens unemployed are starving."

On 22 April 1964, without the consent of the people, a "union" between Tanganyika and Zanzibar was announced and Tanzania was created. While it was hailed as an example of African unity and the constitution of Tanganyika was said to apply to Zanzibar as well, in fact, President Nyerere's rule is not implemented on the island. The Union is proving unworkable because the revolutionary regime on the island insist on behaving like a fully fledged sovereign state and are committed to a revolutionary foreign policy. The Zanzibar authorities have been known to conclude commercial treaties with Soviet bloc states without even notifying Dar-es-Salaam. At one stage Tanganyika recognised West Germany and Zanzibar East Germany. In 1965 elections were held in Tanganyika for the National Assembly but none were held in Zanzibar. All the ministries in Dar are duplicated in Zanzibar."

The *Economist* of 22 April 1967 commenting on this "union" stated:

"Customs Barriers between the mainland and the island are to be removed before the next financial year begins in July. Immigration is not yet controlled by the union government (Tanganyika), nor is there any sign that it will be in the foreseeable future: Zanzibar's 32-man Revolutionary Council, which acts as executive and legislature, still fears a counter-coup, and many people who are welcome on the mainland are *persona non grata* in the islands."

² *Bulletin*. The International Commission of Jurists, June 1967, pp 39-44.

"As the two countries become more and more integrated, the Revolutionary Council, in turn, becomes more superfluous. Its members are fully aware that the final threat to their position lies in a democratically run election. Most islanders would like a general election to coincide with that of the mainland in 1970. The Revolutionary Council would not. Mr. Nyerere will not force them to hold a general election in 1970 unless he feels that the island's security demands it. Even if he does, it is a question whether he could prevent rigging. A merger of the two ruling parties is another necessary step towards integration, but it is not being given priority yet."

Some authorities in the West felt that this "union" would result in President Nyerere establishing control over the island and hence Communist influence would be curtailed. In his *Communism in Africa*,³ Fritz Schatten noted such optimism when he reported:

"Colin Legum commented on this sensational development in the *London Observer*, 26 April 1964, and with particular reference to Babu's position wrote as follows:

"The decision by President Nyerere and President Karume to merge Tanganyika and Zanzibar into a new union is as revolutionary an act as last January's coup which brought the Zanzibar Revolutionary Council to power.

"Everything now depends on the ability of these two leaders to hold their disparate countries together against the challenge of extreme leftists.

"The struggle is not between moderates and militants, but between two sets of militants—the one committed to genuine non-alignment, and the other using non-alignment as a facade to orientate Zanzibar in a Communist direction.

"The conflict has been at the heart of the power struggle inside Zanzibar from the start of the revolution."

"And pointing to Babu's position, Legum wrote:

"Babu's strength came in large measure from his own superb abilities as an effective revolutionary leader. This gave him a clear advantage over the slow, unsure, defensive Karume.

"But his natural capacity for leadership was heavily reinforced by two other circumstances. The first was the financial and moral support given to the revolution after its success by the Communist countries: by the Russians no less than the Chinese. Chinese finance went not only to the Government but to Babu's group in a separate account. This gave him both prestige and financial resources.

"The second circumstance was the equivocal attitudes shown by the western countries to the revolution. Babu exploited this fully to represent the British and the Americans as the enemies of the revolution."

"Only the future can tell how this fusion of the two countries will evolve and whether Western fears that it will open up new opportunities on the mainland for the Communist element in Zanzibar will materialise."

Today the worst fears of the West have indeed materialised and the island is in the hands of the Communist extremists.

The official weekly news sheet *Kuwepe* of 22 April 1967 recorded an interview with Karume in which he said to *Pravda's* correspondent on the occasion of the 50th anniversary year of the Bolshevik coup in Russia of 1917 that the people of Zanzibar shared in the glory of the October Revolution. "We Tanzanians" he continued "of Zanzibar origin greatly value Lenin's struggles and will strive to keep them alive in these countries of ours. . . . We the people of Zanzibar are moulding our government on the pattern of

the Russian Government." Karume ended the interview by expressing the hope that the relations between the two countries would become even more friendly.

The extent of Communist control over the island is complete. The Council of Ministers consists of 10 people of whom 6 are pro-Chinese, 3 pro-Soviet and one non-Communist. The Revolutionary Council consists of 22 people of whom 15 are pro-Chinese, 4 pro-Russian, and 3 are non-Communists. The majority of the members of these two governing bodies are barely literate and terror rather than reason is their chosen instrument of government.

Many wishful-thinkers in the West have put their trust in President Nyerere's allegedly pro-Western sentiments. In February 1967 he nationalised the banks and the *Sunday Times* of 19 February 1967 observed:

"Some observers see the events of the last two weeks as a triumph for the Chinese-inspired Zanzibar Communist, Commerce Minister Mohamed Babu. There have been several Chinese overtones in the whole affair.

"It is significant that the ruling TANU Party's 500,000-strong Youth League which embraces most active males aged six to 40, has been renamed the 'Green Guards'. And there are plenty of books on Mao's thoughts on bookshelves."

While the Old Colonialists never had more than 200 administrators on the island in the past, today the New Colonialists have installed 600 Chinese, 190 East Germans, 100 Russians and some Bulgarians.

Chinese

A 150 strong Chinese military mission trains the People's Liberation Army and their camps are situated at Migombani and Chukwani. Apart from training Zanzibaris in military matters, revolutionaries from other African states receive instruction in guerrilla warfare and subversion and trainees are compelled to study Communist ideology and the writing of Mao Tse-tung.

In an article entitled "Peking's Military Infiltration of Africa" in *Chinese Communist Affairs*,⁴ the author reports that:

"According to a Central News Agency dispatch from Hongkong on 24 April 1965, Peking has recently signed with Tanzania a secret ammunition accord with the provision that the Chinese Reds would supply the Tanzanians with light weapons and equipment for training military and guerrilla personnel.

"According to an article 'Peking's Plots in Tanzania' appearing in *Study of Chinese Affairs* of 30 April 1965 (Vol. 8 No. 4) published by the Intelligence Bureau of the Ministry of National Defense of the Republic of China, Peking's military assistance to Tanzania included the following:

"1. The dispatch of a military mission and 300 training personnel to Tanzania, to take up the planning, organisation, and training of Tanzania's national defence army and militiamen, and also the training of guerrilla forces from other African areas.

"2. The establishment of a training base on Pemba Island. This base is also called the 'liberation bureau'.

"3. The supply of light weapons, which are mostly shipped to Tanzania by boat. Once the Chinese Communists planned to use Ceylon as a mid-way station for this sea transportation.

"4. The establishment of a directing organisation in the Red Chinese 'embassy' in Dar-es-Salaam, capital of Tanzania."

The remainder of the Chinese advisers on the island are concerned with agriculture on the collective farms, state trading organisations and an import-export monopoly, *Bizanje*, which went bankrupt in May 1966. They also carry out extensive political prop-

⁴ Ting Kuang Hua, "Peking's Military Infiltration of Africa", *Chinese Communist Affairs*, April 1966, Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 32.

aganda in the rural areas. A very large number of the Chinese speak Swahili and they are, therefore, more easily understood by the ordinary people.

In a letter to the *Daily Telegraph* of 4 August 1967 Mr. Muhamed bin Abdulla reported that:

"A large number of Chinese women have been transported to Zanzibar for the sole purpose of marrying them to the local people. This export of human beings is to demonstrate Chinese goodwill and to foster blood relationships between China and Africa."

East Germans

Germans from the Soviet Zone run Zanzibar's radio station, the ministries of finance, education and health. They also administer state trading concerns which were confiscated from the Indian shopkeepers. The result of a two-year slum clearance programme begun in 1964 has been the raising of a large part of Zanzibar town and the erection of 150 badly built flats designed for European and not African weather. East Germany cannot afford to supply more building materials and what is available is allotted to building permanent homes for their own advisers. Their attempts to teach Zanzibar engineers and technicians have floundered on the fact that neither they speak German nor the Germans English or Swahili. Naturally all religious programmes on the radio have been banned and propaganda on Communist ideology has been substituted in its place. The following letter was received from Zanzibar on 30 July 1967.

"Ever since the 'revolution' we, the people of Zanzibar, have been plunged into poverty, starvation and misery. The natives of Zanzibar are being most harshly treated. We are daily abused and forced to work in labour gangs. We are told we are engaged in nation building programmes, but Zanzibar has been ruined in every respect. We are both economically and educationally poorer than we have ever been. We have lost most of our young and able qualified men since the so called 'revolution'.

"We are ruled by foreign atheists (Communists) who abuse our religion as well as ourselves. They ask us, Where is your God? Why doesn't He help you now in your suffering?

"We are tired of this slavery but we are helpless and there is nothing we can do about it. All you believers and brother Muslims come to our aid and rid us of this evil doctrine. We Islamic believers of Zanzibar are heartbroken to see a death blow being struck at the very foundations of ethics and morality. These alien atheists are dedicated to undermining the beliefs of Zanzibaris as well as those of the people of neighbouring countries.

"Are there no international organisations which concern themselves with the well-being of other humans? If there are then it is high time that they should look into the situation in Zanzibar and help us. It would be of no avail if the representatives of any organisation should come to Zanzibar without being able to assess the misery of the people freely.

"The Western tourists and reporters are not allowed to see how the masses really suffer. We die of starvation and we are compelled to work long days without food or pay at the end of it.

"All you believers in Islam ought to know that our religion is at stake. It is your duty to help your brother Muslims. All you believers in God must realise that this evil cancer eats at the very soul of human beings. It is not directed against a particular religion but against all religions in general."

The East Germans have introduced a system of informers in every government department to check on the political reliability of employees, and they provide officers for the secret police.

³ Fritz Schatten, *Communism in Africa*. G. Allen and Unwin, 1966 pp. 214-215.

Increasing evidence is becoming available of a clash between the Chinese on the one hand and the East Germans and Russians on the other. The Chinese live by themselves without African servants; do their own washing and ironing and spend all their time working in the country whereas the European Communists tend to work in the cities; dress well; have servants and patronise the bars and hotels. The *Standard* of 6 May 1967 of Dar-es-Salaam reported that President Nyerere stated when touring a Chinese agricultural project that he "admired the simple conditions in which the 37 Chinese experts lived. Especially when one considers what other experts would have demanded before taking on such a project."

Sino-East German relationships started to go sour in July 1966 when the East Germans founded the People's Bank of Zanzibar with £800,000 provided by the Chinese for other purposes. This was strongly resented by the Chinese. Because 97 per cent of the population is Muslim, the East Germans carry favour with Zanzibaris by propagating information on the persecution of Muslims in China's north western territories. This kind of inter-Communist squabbling is reported to be having an adverse effect on such economic development as there is on the island.

Russians

The Soviets have overall control of the defence of the island, and they have their own training camp for the People's Liberation Army at Mtoni. They also control the harbour and scrutinise all imports and exports. The Russians are quite prepared to stay in the background and let the East Germans advance their cause. Willie Babu is the protégé of the Chinese, Abdulla Hanga, former Vice-President of the island, is the most pro-Russian of the present members of the National Assembly, besides which one of his wives is Russian.

The size of the army at 5,000 men is quite disproportionate to the total population of 300,000. Its main role seems to be internal security, but undoubtedly some of its members operate on the mainland in various guerrilla warfare roles. Its uniforms are Cuban-style, and its weapons a mixture of Soviet, Chinese and Czechoslovak. It is anybody's guess why such a tiny island needs field guns and anti-aircraft guns as well as armoured personnel carriers (a picture of one is shown on the cover) especially when one remembers that the Old Colonialists did not have any army at all! While the men and NCOs are trained locally, officers go for higher military training to Cuba, the Soviet Union, China and Eastern Europe. Many of the instructors are Cuban. This People's Liberation Army is quite separate from the army of Tanganyika on the mainland which is Sandhurst-trained, British equipped and with some Canadian signal officers and so Western-orientated that a Chinese military mission to that country left after a short period. A large number of weapons from Zanzibar crossed over to equip the rebel forces of Antoine Gizenga in the Congo and some were intercepted in Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda. Many have appeared in Mozambique.

Commenting on the Trojan Horse nature of the People's Liberation Army, Ian Colvin who visited the island reported in the *Sunday Telegraph* of 30 January 1966:

"It is an army within an army. For its Chinese, Russian and East German weapons are more modern and more plentiful than those of Nyerere's Tanzanian units on the mainland. Russian and East German training officers live a segregated life in Zanzibar.

"Why so many armoured cars and field guns should be concentrated in Zanzibar for an army of 1,200 is a riddle. Nominally these troops come under the Defence Ministry in Dar-es-Salaam. Actually they are controlled by Sheikh Abeld Karume, Vice-President of Tanzania and virtual ruler of Zanzibar.

The first aim of these New Colonialists from the Communist bloc was to destroy the fabric of a free society. A free press and any form of organised opposition was suppressed. All non-Communist books have been burnt and propaganda publications put in their place. Cinemas no longer show Western films. Chinese and Eastern bloc propaganda films have been substituted. All radios have been confiscated and one-channel loudspeakers have been installed in public places. A strict censorship is imposed on all incoming mail and all outgoing documents are carefully examined. Citizens of the town of Zanzibar are not allowed to move outside the three mile radius without a permit. No one can come into or leave the island without a permit—even to Dar-es-Salaam, the capital of Tanzania! Westerners, and particularly journalists, are discouraged from paying visits. Formerly free Zanzibar is now a closed society. The only welcome strangers are members of the African "liberation" movements who plan to subvert or overthrow the government in their homelands.

The general situation in the island in the summer of 1967 is that the few remaining freedoms have been taken away from the citizens. After normal hours of work, they are forced to do 'voluntary service' till late at night for no additional pay. This includes both sexes, young and old. Girls called up for paramilitary service have to live in camps with men which results in immorality. No parent is allowed to complain or object. The *Sunday Telegraph* of 19 March 1967 reported that three young nuns in Tanzania had been called up for a two-year period. "During national service they will be expected to live in camps with men, abandon their starched black and white habits for near mini khaki skirts and do bayonet and arms training."

As is customary in totalitarian states, power corrupts. Recently news has been received of a wave of raping in the island of girls between the ages of 6 and 7 which started at the beginning of May. Many of those concerned had to be taken to hospital. Karume has merely announced that anybody found talking about this matter will be severely punished.

In accordance with the custom in other Communist countries, the citizens are compelled to attend mass rallies organised by the regime. The *Reporter* of 4 November 1966 of Nairobi carried an eye witness report of such an event:

"I took up a position near the Law Courts (in Zanzibar) to watch the demonstration. It came headed by a group of people in white kanzus jumping and chanting. Every house and shop was locked. The leaders were followed by a couple of Youth Wingers, dressed in green shirts with blue berets. They carried a huge banner in English 'Let Our Glorious Revolution Go Forward'. Then came goose-stepping girls, dressed in green and blue. Then a platoon of infantry. Then a banner carrying 'Drive the Whites from Rhodesia'—this in Swahili.

"Then came the unfortunate populace being driven from behind by youth-wingers. When a gap was formed, because some of the people were too old to keep up with the leaders, they were made to break into a run. An old woman stood watching. I had seen her arrive. She was very, very old and very, very lame. A youth-winger, knee high to a half-pint pot, wearing sergeant's stripes, went up to the old lady. He spoke to her and pointed to the throng of shambling people. She pointed to her leg. She pleaded. It was of no avail, she was smartly cuffed and then dragged and made to march.

"Some youngsters, varying in age from 8-12 were playing a game of football on the green at the road junction. They were not even interested in the marchers. They were enjoying their game. A gang of youth-wingers set about them. Some escaped and cocked a snook, but others were forced to march.

"At this stage I was spotted by one of the youth-wingers. He came to me and ordered

me to march. I told him I was English, and that I had no intention of marching. 'March', he roared, and brandished his stick. 'Make me' I invited—and he courageously set off in chase of a boy of six, and caught him. The police flanked the procession. A policeman stood at the junction of the road. They did nothing to prevent the youth-wingers activities."

Needless-to-say no private property is respected. The *Times* of January 18, 1967 carried a Reuter report from Zanzibar which stated that:

"The Zanzibar Government today announced confiscation of three more plantations—two belonging to Arabs and one to an Indian in the north of the island. More than 500 coconut, fruit, clove, and other plantations have been taken over in the past two years under a Government land reform scheme. Many of them have been split into small plots, which become the property of peasant families.

"A Zanzibar decree passed in 1964 allows confiscation of property without compensation where it is considered in the national interest."

The following letter was written on 28 May 1967 and smuggled out of Zanzibar. The name of the writer cannot be revealed because of the possibility of reprisals against members of his family who are still on the island:

"Conditions are getting worse everyday. Every fortnight in our island of Tumbatu 90 people are taken across to the main island of Zanzibar and are forced to do a hard day's labour, without being given food and they are not paid for their labour. When they are returned to their homes they have no food to feed their families.

"The people of Zanzibar are no longer masters of their destiny. They are deprived of all the amenities of the state. Zanzibar today is ruled by foreigners. All government offices are manned by Communists from the mainland of Tanganyika and other foreigners. Unemployment has risen sharply. Recently a delegation of Zanzibaris went to President Karume to complain about this state of affairs. They begged to be employed even in the most menial jobs so that they could earn a living, but the President told them that it was these foreigners who organized and carried out the coup of 1964 and therefore, they must now rule the country. They were told that they could go and till the land or go fishing. However when they pointed out that they were not even given the facilities to do either; they were forcibly ejected from the President's office. They were beaten up with rifle butts. They were then warned that any further complaints of this nature from them could lead to their imprisonment.

"Innocent people are still being arbitrarily arrested. These arrests take place at night. The arrests are organised and led by the East Germans. The victims are awakened at night and are not even given the opportunity to change from their night garments. They are blind-folded so that they may not recognise their captors nor can they know where they are being taken to. The relatives of such victims must not complain nor can they ask of their whereabouts or the reason for their arrest. Attempts to find what has befallen such victims could lead one into jail also. Rumours abound that some of them have since died of torture. Among those suspected of having died from torture are Mohammed Amour Mohamed Barwani, Saleh Ali Master, Saleh Saadallah (ex-Minister of the current regime) etc. No one seems to know their whereabouts and the authorities would not let their relatives know.

"We are fed up with this terrorist regime. No one seems to care what happens to us. We are treated far worse than animals in our own homeland. How long must we endure this inhuman treatment? Will no one help?"

Almost all imports of manufactured goods now come from the Sino-Soviet bloc and persons seeking higher education, either technical or university, are obliged to study in the bloc. Graduates from Western universities are distrusted. Party and government personnel receive higher instruction in political, administrative, police and intelligence matters in institutions in the various countries of the bloc including Cuba.

Soviet merchant ships and trawlers engaged in surveillance and espionage throughout the Indian Ocean use the harbour at Zanzibar as their base.

For external purposes the Communists skillfully use Karume, the nominal head of the government, as a patriotic facade. In fact, Babu is probably the most useful indigenous politician as an agent of the New Colonialists.

Appendices I and II on pages 30 and 38 contain two statements by Zanzibaris who have escaped from their homeland on conditions in the island.

THE LESSONS FOR FREE AFRICA

How does all this affect the rest of Africa?

To the tragic example of Ghana, on the West coast, can now be added Zanzibar, on the East, as an example of a nation taken over by the New Colonialists. The only difference being that in the former the army was able to stop the rot before it was too late.

Apportioning blame seldom achieves much, but with the wisdom of hindsight, it would appear that the freely elected Zanzibar Government which attained independence from the British was overconfident. It saw the Old Colonialists as its main enemy and underestimated the power, ruthlessness and effectiveness of the New Colonialists from the East.

The newly elected government through over-cautiousness lest it be accused of neo-colonialist tendencies did not sign a defense treaty with Britain. It relied wholly on the police force which was largely dominated by mainland Africans. They have paid dearly for such unwise notions for if the members of the cabinet are still alive, they are languishing in prison today.

With the example of the Congo for all to see, the Zanzibar leaders should have been more alert; more certain who were their friends and who their real enemies and more alive to the need for effective internal security against Communist-backed rebels. A number of well-meaning but ignorant people in certain African states hailed the Zanzibar "revolution" as a victory in the struggle against "neo-colonialism." But Zanzibar today, is itself a threat to their own security. The imperialist nature of the regime in Zanzibar is made quite clear in the following publication which is produced in Communist Albania called, *Revolution in Africa** which stated:

"Zanzibar stands out as a shining example of how quickly and satisfactorily the revolution can develop and mature when well-trained Communists control the undisciplined united-front rabble.

"A small cadre of Chinese-trained activists led by Muhamed Babu was able to organize and control a popular nationalist movement and to lead the united-front to a glorious victory over the Arab forces of imperialism and reaction.

"Babu and the enlightened cadres are now poised to capture control of the united front in Tanzania just as they did in Zanzibar. Then the revolution will spread to Kenya and Uganda. Nationalist reactionaries such as Nyerere, Kenyatta and Obote who tried to speak out of both sides of their mouths at the same time will suffer the fate of Jamshid,

the former Sultan of Zanzibar, and his stooge Shamte/Muhsein government. It is imperative that if Marxist-Leninists are to achieve victory in all East Africa that they must first gain control of the united front as Mao has taught. We are too few alone. Then we have the upper hand, and we know how to deal with the deceivers of the people, the imperialists' tools, Nyerere, Kenyatta and Obote. Their personal aggrandisement will not be forgotten. The oppression of the people will be avenged."

The terrible struggle between a world half-free and half-Communist is not a white man's problem. It is not a distant affair in Europe. It is not restricted to the United States and the Soviet Union but it is a desperately serious threat to the freedom and independence of the nations of Africa, Asia, and South America. As the Indians found out to their cost, all talk of neutralism is laughable. One is either Communist or anti-Communist. No one can contract out of the Cold War. Such a view is childish. Tibet tried to and she is a tragic victim of rape by the New Colonialists. Africa has not rid itself of the Old Colonialists merely to substitute in their place the new tyranny of the New Colonialists.

Africans of all races would do well to heed the advice offered in a letter written by an exiled Zanzibari, Haroun Bin Ishaka, which was published in the *Reporter of Nairobi* of 7 October 1966 which read in part:

"The chauvinistic clique which has amassed enormous power for itself (in Zanzibar) vacillates in policy between outright fascism and left wing Communism, which Lenin aptly dubbed 'an infantile disorder'.

"It is a shame that Russia, China and the German Democratic Republic have allowed their names to be associated with such banality . . .

"Tyranny is bad, whoever practices it. It is high time that all enlightened Africans and others joined in a mighty crusade for freedom of the individual and human rights. How right was Dr. Azikiwe when he said: 'If independence means the substitution of indigenous tyranny for alien rule then those who struggle for independence have not only desecrated the cause of freedom but have betrayed their people.'"

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

As in Cuba, one thing is certain about Zanzibar and that is that the New Colonialists will use it as a base from which to try and subvert neighbouring territories. They will train revolutionaries to overthrow their elected governments. Evidence of this has already been found in Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda. Were the army mutinies in those countries in 1964 just mutinies?

If lasting peace is to return to East Africa it will only occur when Zanzibar regains her freedom and that Communist base for subversion there is eliminated as has happened in Ghana. What makes it all the more difficult is that while Nkrumah's army was trained in Britain and loyal to the cause of freedom, in Zanzibar there is no potentially counter-revolutionary military force which could overthrow the revolutionary regime. It would be irresponsible to incite unarmed civilians to rise against the Chinese and Soviet equipped People's Liberation Army for they would just get massacred. There seems, therefore, to be little hope of the internal revolt. What is needed is for all true freedom-loving nations, and especially the neighbouring African States, to give full moral and material support to the people of Zanzibar and rid them of their oppressors. There must not be any repetition of a Bay of Pigs type episode, and there must be an absolute determination to go through to complete victory in overthrowing the present terrorist regime. Its Communist backers must be sent packing.

If this is not done, there will be no peace in East Africa and the influence of the New Colonialists will spread.

When this has been achieved, a report similar to *Nkrumah's Subversion in Africa* (Ministry of Information, Accra, 1966) must be published and circulated throughout the other states of Africa showing how the New Colonialists operate, and it must recommend steps that should be taken to ensure that precious independence so recently gained from the Old Colonialists does not fall into the hands of the New Colonialists.

APPEAL TO HUMANITY: ZANZIBAR IS STILL UNDER A REIGN OF TERROR

ZANZIBAR ORGANIZATION,
Hampshire, England.

We, Zanzibaris of all races and creed, are extremely perturbed at the conspiracy of silence, regarding the deplorable conditions still existing in the police state of Zanzibar. We therefore, appeal to each and every one of you once again for your active support in condemning openly the violations of our Fundamental Human Rights, and Freedoms (embodied in Article 1 Paragraph 3 of the United Nations Charter and Universal Declaration of Human Rights).

We appeal to you in the name of Justice and Human Dignity to help us individually and collectively to bring pressure to bear upon the United Nations to intervene on behalf of Zanzibar immediately to:

1. Stop the continued reign of terror.
2. Release political and other detainees, or insist on their being given a fair trial.
3. Stop forced labour on the pretext of voluntary labour (Kujitolea).
4. Stop immediately continuing arbitrary floggings, arrests and detention of innocent and law-abiding citizens.
5. Stop racial discrimination especially in education, employment and participation in the government.
6. End violation of our basic human rights and freedoms in particular, to restore freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of speech, the right of free elections, the right to a fair trial and the freedom of the press.
7. Stop certain powers sending arms to Zanzibar, making it a centre of subversion against friendly neighbouring countries and violating our country's sovereignty and independence and interfering directly in the internal affairs of African states contrary to the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter.

In particular, we appeal to all freedom loving nations to help us in our struggle to restore the rule of law, civil liberties and multi-party democracy in our country.

We demand that the popular will of our people should be the basis of the authority of our government and that it should be expressed by free elections in accordance with Paragraph 3 of Article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

AHMED SEIF KHARUSI.

IDEAS OF CONVERTING COAL INTO GASOLINE AND OTHER PETROLEUMLIKE DERIVATIVES START TO LOOK PRACTICAL AFTER 7-YEAR SPURT OF RESEARCH AIDED BY GOVERNMENT—PROSPECTS LURE OILMEN INTO COAL BUSINESS, MAGAZINE REPORTS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I was the sponsor during World War II years of coal-to-synthetic liquid fuels research and development legislation when a Member of the House of Representatives, Senator Joseph O'Mahoney, of Wyoming,

* *Revolution in Africa* "The Application of Mao's Precepts on Popular Revolution" Tirana, Albania, March, 1965.

was the chief sponsor in this body. I was gratified to read an article in the June 1, 1968, issue of Business Week magazine under the heading, "Putting a Coal Tiger in Your Tank."

It has always been a matter of regret to me that the Randolph-O'Mahoney Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of 1944—Public Law 78-290—was not reauthorized and further funded during the Eisenhower administration and that there was a research and development gap until the Coal Research Act of 1960—Public Law 86-599—provided ways and means for renewal of research and development in the field of coal to gasoline and other petroleumlike derivatives.

The article in Business Week is an encouraging summary of developments and forecasts that indicate clearly how valid and vital was the action by the 86th Congress in authorizing the establishment of the Office of Coal Research in the Department of the Interior. It has been a source of much gratification that the present Senators from West Virginia were among the vigorous supporters and original cosponsors of the progressive legislation which spawned the successful coal research program of the 1960's. If that program had been more adequately funded during the past half dozen years, I truly believe that some of the important research and development projects described or referred to in the recent article as being on the horizon, might be productive realities today, rather than hopes for the future.

Coal does indeed have a real and vital part to perform in the future of this country. This great industry must not be stifled. It should be encouraged to advance to meet its potentials and its responsibilities in the interest of fulfilling future missions of broader scope in the fuels and energy field when other sources may be less plentiful in an industrial society with a growing fuels and energy requirement. Meanwhile, an even stronger and more accelerated effort should be made in air pollution control research to develop new pollution abatement technology in the burning and processing of coal and other forms of fuel and energy.

Coal mining, it must be remembered, is not an industrial procedure that can be controlled by the manipulation of values and other control devices. A still-productive coal mine closed is a coal mine destroyed forever, with huge investments wasted and much of the coal therein unreachable for both technical and safety reasons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from Business Week magazine to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUTTING A COAL TIGER IN YOUR TANK—IDEAS FOR CONVERTING COAL INTO GASOLINE AND OTHER PETROLEUMLIKE DERIVATIVES START TO LOOK PRACTICAL AFTER A 7-YEAR SPURT OF GOVERNMENT-AIDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT—PROSPECT LURES OILMEN INTO COAL BUSINESS

Since the late 1920s, when the Germans built the first commercial plant to turn Ruhr

coal into oil and gasoline, coal conversion has been technically feasible. The big stumbling block has been the cost.

Gasoline produced from coal in the U.S. would have cost two to three times as much as that produced from crude oil.

In the last four years, however, U.S. companies have been quietly intensifying their research on coal conversion. R&D has reached the point where conversion now begins to look practical. And nearly every major oil company has acquired coal lands or a coal-producing subsidiary.

Coal deals

In just the past month, for example, Standard Oil Co. (Ohio) acquired Old Ben Coal Corp. of Illinois, Shell Oil Co. won exploratory rights to Crow Indian lands in Montana, and Atlantic Richfield Co. took a one-year option to buy Little Bear Coal Co. of Colorado.

Why the rising interest in coal conversion? The most important reason is that the U.S. is rapidly running out of oil reserves. At the present depletion rate, known oil reserves will only last until the 1980s, according to the Bureau of Mines. Known coal reserves, by contrast, could last until 2280 or so.

Other reasons for the growing interest in coal as a source of gasoline and oil include: Coal's new status as a profitable fuel for electric utilities.

Improved technology in areas of chemistry similar to coal conversion.

The attempt of some oil companies to get into all forms of energy production, and the fear of others of staying out.

For many years, investing in coal was simply "a question of how long you could keep your capital tied up," says Gulf Oil Corp. President B. R. Dorsey. Today, most estimates give new gasoline-from-coal techniques eight to 10 years to reach the market.

Federal fuel

The speedup in coal research has been powered largely by the Interior Dept.'s Office of Coal Research. OCR was formed in 1961 to do for coal what George Washington Carver did for the peanut.

"OCR has played a damned important role" in stimulating coal conversion research, says Dr. C. W. Montgomery, chief scientist at Gulf Research & Development Co.

"It's been a great factor in accelerating the trend," adds Edwin T. Layng, executive vice-president of Hydrocarbon Research, Inc.

OCR-sponsored R&D projects have slashed the production cost of gasoline-from-coal to within a penny or two of the 10¢-to-12¢-per-gallon range needed to compete with gasoline from pumped oil. What's more, OCR has also spurred research to convert coal to a number of other salable products such as natural gas, sulfur, fly ash, diesel oil, and basic materials for making plastics.

Research projects on all this work—totaling about \$40-million in the last seven years—have been farmed out by OCR to such companies as Westinghouse Electric Corp., the Consolidation Coal Co. subsidiary of Continental Oil Co., Melpar, Inc., FMC Corp., and Skeist Laboratories, Inc.

Spark plug

The instigator of most OCR coal-conversion research projects has been Neal Cochran, director of utilization at OCR.

Cochran, 51, envisions giant coal-to-gasoline refineries (such as the one diagrammed above) rising next to coal mines in Wyoming, Montana, West Virginia, and Kentucky. The giant plants would produce gasoline, crude oil, fuel oil, natural gas, sulfur, and a special type of low-pollutant coal.

The cost of building such an integrated plant—combining many of the ideas now being checked out—would be about \$300-million, Cochran estimates, only slightly more than a simple coal-to-gasoline refinery.

Powerful attraction

Cochran believes that integrated plants would have the additional economic advantage of being able to turn out more than enough cheap electric power to satisfy their own needs. Revenues could be boosted by selling surplus power to other manufacturers, such as chemical producers and metal processors, attracted to set up shop nearby.

There are doubters, however, especially when it comes to the idea of generating cheap, salable electric power from coal conversion. Moreover, natural gas from coal might be marketable only in the East, where the cost of pipeline gas is relatively high.

On the other hand, the sales potential of synthetic fuel oil and low-ash coal is affirmed by a growing number of researchers. Such coal conversion by-products, they agree, would not be dependent for success on the local cost of electric power and natural gas, or sales of building products.

FATTENING UP THE FUEL

All coal-to-gasoline conversion processes developed so far are basically similar. Coal is high in carbon molecules, low in hydrogen molecules, crude oil is the opposite. Thus, hydrogen has to be added to the coal, at high temperatures and pressures.

OCR's contributions to the technology have been to find new ways to reduce heat requirements, pressure demands (by some 80%), and the amount of hydrogen needed.

Dual process

In Cochran's giant refinery, the coal would first be prepared for hydrogenation—either by crushing and gasification or by dissolving and heating. This dual arrangement, he claims, would make refinery design flexible enough to fit both Eastern bituminous coal, which gasifies fairly easily, or Western lignite coal, which dissolves better.

In one part of the refinery, dissolved coal would be put into solution with an oily coal extract, and filtered through a rotating drum to remove sulfur and other inorganic materials. The purified coal solution then would be put through a flash evaporation step, and the residue would be hydrogenated or sold as low-ash coal.

Meanwhile, in the other part of the refinery, crushed and gasified coal would go through a multiple-stage distillation. (Such a process has been developed and tested on bench-scale by FMC Corp.)

Adding hydrogen

Gradual heating would be required to prevent hydrogen atoms in the coal slurry from breaking away; additional hydrogen might have to be added in this step. But Cochran thinks the distillation process is eminently practical.

By-products of the char obtained from the distillation process—carbon monoxide and hydrogen—could be combined in a gas plant with derivatives of the condensation phase—carbon dioxide, methane, and hydrogen sulfide. These would yield salable sulfur and natural gas, plus hydrogen.

The Institute of Gas Technology has been concentrating on this part of the operation.

On way to gas pump

Hydrogen produced in this manner would be piped to a hydro-treating plant, where it would be swirled around in a reactor called an ebullating bed (developed by Hydrocarbon Research) with primitive crude from the distillation unit. A zinc chloride catalyst, developed by Consolidation Coal, might be used at this point to ease the conversion of primitive crude to gasoline, thereby reducing the hydrogen requirement.

Power for the entire operation would be provided either by burning carbon monoxide from the gasifier operation or char, the residue of distillation.

A TIME OF TESTING

How soon such an integrated coal-to-gasoline plant may go into operation is a matter of debate. So far, only one OCR research project—Consolidation Coal's operation at Cresap, W. Va.—has reached the operating pilot-plant stage. Most other OCR-sponsored research has only been verified in the laboratory.

Furthermore, coal conversion has had quite a few false starts in the U.S. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) brought a coal-to-gas process to this country from Germany, only to drop it after the East Texas oil strike of 1930.

Union Carbide Corp. and Koppers Co., Inc., undertook coal hydrogenation to produce petrochemicals after World War II, when another oil drought was predicted. When the oil shortage did not materialize, support for both projects evaporated.

Most oil companies have gone through periods of great excitement about coal-conversion ideas. Gulf at one time even had a project to turn petroleum into coal.

Rival products

Another cloud is the threat of competition from oil shale and tar sands. Shale is in roughly the same research position as coal, but tar sand refineries—owned by Sun Oil Co. and by a consortium of Gulf, Cities Service Co., Jersey Standard, and Richfield—are already pumping oil to the U.S. from Canada.

Still, estimated reserves of oil shale and tar sands are "not even close" to those of coal, according to Robert F. Mansfield, section supervisor of Gulf's R&D Petroleum Economics Section. Coal reserves exceed those of tar sands by 10 to 1, says Mansfield; Hydrocarbon Research's Laying puts the ratio at 9 to 1. But both men agree that a major discovery of tar sands in the U.S.—though unlikely—would set back coal-conversion work.

Oilmen undaunted

Such worries apparently are not hindering the coal-oriented plans of oil companies. Humble Oil & Refining Co. is now operating its own coal-conversion pilot plant at Baytown, Tex., and has bought out most of the coal lands in southern Illinois. Atlantic Richfield and Hydrocarbon Research have agreed to build a pilot plant jointly, if OCR funds come through. And Gulf is looking into treatment of coal prior to the refinery operation for possible economies.

Thus, the Office of Coal Research has really done just about all it set out to do. When it began investigating coal conversion in 1961, most coal companies were small, family-owned operations. Only a few, such as Consolidation and Pittsburg & Midway Coal Mining Co. now a Gulf subsidiary, were doing any research to lift coal out of the doldrums. Even for these companies, the cost of a full-scale commercial coal-to-gasoline research program would have been out of the question.

Confidence

Today, however, many coal companies are owned by big oil companies that can afford substantial R&D budgets. If the economics of coal conversion looks attractive enough to them, there is every reason to believe they will move ahead and build production facilities. Thus, even if Congress cuts OCR's research budget, most observers feel that coal conversion work won't be halted again.

A good example of how coal companies are beginning to think in terms of a future pegged to oil and gas sales was seen recently when the National Coal Assn. came out against increased oil imports for chemical companies. And the day may not be far off when a senator from West Virginia or Wyoming rises on the Senate floor to defend the oil-depletion allowance.

Says one Washington coal lobbyist: "When an oilman calls now, we write down his name."

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the following is a report to the people of the 12th District of Massachusetts:

WASHINGTON REPORT, JUNE 1968

(By Congressman HASTINGS KEITH, 12th District of Massachusetts)

LOAVES AND FISHES

Americans were shocked by the news that hunger and malnutrition exist in our own country—to the extent that some babies suffer mental damage and shortened lives from their meager diets. The child below is one of the many which a CBS report says may suffer life-long injury from malnutrition.

This tragedy is world-wide. Of the 3.4 billion people in the world, 2.2 billion are underfed; 600 million are physically ill from hunger. In our own city of New Bedford, however, a start has been made in tapping the incredibly abundant but virtually unexploited food resources of the sea to aid the underfed here and abroad.

Alpine Marine Protein Industries has gone into full production of "fish flour" for human consumption—a tasteless, high protein powder made from whole fish. Scientists and governments the world over have recognized its potential for bringing life-saving nutrition to millions of people.

Real credit for the success of this program belongs to former Sens. Saltonstall and Douglas and to the news media who recognized the potential in FPC. I am proud of course of the role which our office played too.

RESURRECTION CITY

Less than a mile from the Capitol sprawl hundreds of wooden tent-like structures—Resurrection City, home of the Poor People's Campaign.

The Reverend Ralph Abernathy, Dr. King's successor as leader of the march, explained to me and some of my colleagues the goals of the 3000 poor people. Jobs, decent housing, and education are the legitimate aims of the Campaign—and every participant is committed to peacefully petitioning Congress and the Administration for help in achieving those aims.

Bigger and costlier government programs are not the answer—as even the liberals are admitting today, our country cannot be run from Washington. State and local governments, as well as private industry, must be encouraged and stimulated to provide jobs, better education, and decent low-cost housing.

As long as the poor people uphold their commitment to non-violence, they are welcome in Washington. Legislation to meet their needs is even now pending before Congress.

DOUBLE BARRELED CRISIS—A PROPOSED SOLUTION

Interest rates are at their highest level since the civil war—and the taxpayer is paying \$15 billion annually in interest alone on the public debt. Inflation is eating up the buying power of the dollar, and continues to soar. Since 1960, the Federal government has spent \$57 billion more than it has taken in. We must put our fiscal house in order.

On the other hand, millions of Americans live in abject poverty—our cities are powderkegs of unrest and discontent—jobs, education, and decent housing are essential to any efforts to help the poor. Such programs cost money—even if, as I believe it must be, private industry is mobilized to provide the capital and know how.

To reconcile these outwardly conflicting crises, I've joined more than 70 Republican

colleagues in calling for a program of human renewal—and drastic cuts in non-essentials such as highway beautification, civilian space programs, and the SST. Through such deferrals of non-essentials, we would pare the budget \$6.6 billion—and immediately redirect \$2.5 billion of that savings toward meeting urgent human needs. The graph below illustrates our proposed allocation of additional Human Renewal Funds.

[In millions]

Urban reserve fund (to be allocated) -	\$1,000
Vocational education -	250
Housing -	250
Pollution control -	250
Crime -	100
Rural revitalization -	100
District of Columbia -	50
Jobs -	500

GOOD NEWS FOR THE CONSUMER

The Consumer Credit Protection Act has been signed into law—and now American consumers will know exactly how much it costs to purchase credit and borrow money. The truth-in-lending measure marks another milestone in the government's effort to protect the consumer in the complex arena of buying, selling, and advertising.

ON A RELATED SUBJECT

Massachusetts' difficulties with auto insurance are shared by drivers nationwide—cancelled policies, soaring rates, and delays in processing claims are all too prevalent. A comprehensive study of the auto insurance industry has just been authorized—and we hope to find out what's wrong and how to correct it.

CONCERNED CONSTITUENTS

During my first office hours at Weymouth Town Hall (to be held every Monday but the third of each month from 7-9 p.m.) Nick Santacroce and four Weymouth High students dropped by to discuss urgent social problems. Next to me is Brian McGroarty, and seated are Ellen Rennie, Betsy Abby, and Bill Murphy.

MERCHANT MARINE—SINKING FAST

America's merchant fleet and her shipbuilding industries have a long and proud fighting tradition. Now, however, they are battling for their life against the strangest enemy of all: their own government.

The Johnson Administration has proposed drastic cuts in the number of ships to be added to our dwindling merchant fleet. A massive building program is needed to keep up with the drop-out rate of over-age ships in our fleet. The President's decision could thus scuttle what is left of our merchant marine, at a time when the Soviets are building their own fleet at a feverish pace.

The Administration proposal to allow building of US ships in foreign yards also endangers our shipbuilding industry—and the jobs of hundreds of employees at the Fore River yard in Quincy. The loss of business to our own industry would mean millions of dollars flowing overseas, and could deprive our country of the essential shipbuilding capacity needed in wartime.

The Congress is solidly opposed to such a policy of retreat. America's worldwide posture in commerce and defense is at stake, and we must not allow the seas around us to be dominated by other nations.

GUSHER IN THE WRONG PLACE

This spring tourists on San Juan's resort beaches were forced to scramble ashore as millions of gallons of oil flooded in from an Esso tanker. The ship struck a reef in San Juan harbor, and US authorities were faced with their first major oil pollution disaster.

I visited the scene of the wreck to see how the Coast Guard's cleanup plans worked, and to see if new laws were needed to ensure fast action against the pollution. I reported to the House Public Works Committee that

every shore town in Massachusetts was vulnerable to similar accidents, and recommended new anti-pollution legislation.

Action is now nearly complete on a program to make polluters strictly liable for oil damage, and to provide fast cleanup action. This protection is vital to all towns whose beaches are in danger from tanker-caused pollution.

AND THE RETURNS CAME

For a time we thought the deluge of poll returns would never end; the mountain was growing, not shrinking! We finally slit the last envelope, and sent the questionnaires to be tabulated. The results, and my comments as I revealed them to my House colleagues, are at the bottom of the page.

Hardly had the questionnaire left the press when the President announced his decision not to seek re-election and his new efforts toward a negotiated peace. As if that didn't complicate interpretation of the returns enough, before a week had passed we witnessed the tragic assassination of Dr. King and the ensuing outbreak of violence in our nation's cities. As a result, over 500 letters of further clarification accompanied the polls—adding to my understanding of how 12th District residents feel about the major issues.

"RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE TO CITIZENS OF THE 12TH DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS"

	Yes	No	Unknown
1. Do you approve of the President's conduct of the Vietnam war?	29.1	54.5	8.7
2. In North Vietnam, do you favor (a) intensified U.S. air attacks; (b) a bombing halt; or (c) maintaining air attacks at the present level?	(a) 37.1 (b) 35.8 (c) 17.1		
3. Should the United States continue to trade with nations that are aiding North Vietnam?	17.3	68.4	6.8
4. Do you believe the American people are receiving sufficient information from the Government on vital foreign and domestic issues to allow them to vote intelligently?	21.1	64.0	7.4
5. Do you support the administration's proposed increase in taxes?	35.6	50.2	6.8
6. Do you believe that Federal spending on domestic programs should be reduced?	48.9	38.6	4.8
7. Should industries which install equipment to reduce air and water pollution be granted tax credits by the Federal Government to offset part of the expense involved?	59.8	26.7	5.7
8. Do you favor returning a percentage of the tax money collected by the Federal Government to State and local governments to be used as they see fit?	49.9	32.5	9.7
9. Do you favor Federal legislation to celebrate Memorial Day, George Washington's Birthday, and Veteran's Day on Monday each year?	50.0	39.6	3.5
10. Do you favor my Marine Sanctuaries Act, which would prohibit drilling or exploring for oil in certain fishing and recreation zones of our seas?	80.3	7.0	5.5
11. Do you approve making Plymouth Rock (and 10 or 15 adjacent acres) into a national memorial park?	64.4	19.4	8.7
12. Do you support the administration's proposal to tax travel overseas?	38.1	50.2	4.5

EXTENSION OF THE REED ACT

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 272 would extend for an additional period of 5 years the time which States may obligate, for administrative purposes, certain funds transferred from excess Federal unemployment tax collections.

These transferred funds have been used by the States primarily to buy necessary land and construct buildings for use in the employment security program under prior authority provided in the so-called Reed Act.

Alaska is one of 17 States which has not yet built buildings under the Reed Act. However, during the recently concluded session of the Alaska State Legislature, the legislature appropriated \$45,000 to enable the Alaska State Department of Labor to erect buildings in the more remote areas of the State where the employment service would be able to reach a larger segment of the Alaskan population needing employment service.

It is anticipated that the extension of the existing authority, as proposed by the provisions of H.R. 272, would permit

the State of Alaska to build two badly needed employment service buildings. One will be built at Bethel—a center of native population—and another at Glennallen.

The State has advised me that in connection with the Bethel building, approval already has been secured from the Federal Government for payment of rent for the period of time required to amortize the cost of construction. This rental money will revert back to the unemployment trust fund if H.R. 272 is not passed. In the event that H.R. 272 is enacted, the rental money received from the Bethel facility would revert to a revolving fund, whereby additional buildings may be built.

Another factor which should be considered in the event H.R. 272 is enacted would be the availability of additional funds during the next 5 years for similar construction in Alaska.

I have been informed that in the spring of 1967 all State employment security administrators were polled by the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies to determine whether or not they favored H.R. 272. Of the jurisdictions eligible to vote, 51 voted to support H.R. 272. Puerto Rico disqualified itself from voting, because it has no Reed Act funds.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,
May 27, 1968]

"QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS"

"Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker the people of the 12th District of Massachusetts have given an enthusiastic response to a poll on the vital issues we are currently facing at home and abroad. We have just completed tabulating the answers to my questionnaire from some 10,000 citizens of the communities I have the privilege to represent.

"This response is to me a reminder of the fact that we do indeed have government by the people. While in the final analysis, we all recognize that as elected Representatives of the people we must make the final decisions on how to vote on the various measures brought before us, questionnaires are undoubtedly one of the most valuable channels of direct communication between the Representative and the people.

"The opinions of my constituents on all 12 issues are contained in the complete report attached below.

"I urge other Members of Congress to adopt this practice in order to better communicate with the people they serve.

Since this legislation is extremely beneficial to assist Alaska in serving more effectively the rural areas of the State, I strongly support H.R. 272. No appropriation of any additional Federal funds is required.

I AM AMERICA

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD three outstanding essays by students of Compton Junior High School in Bakersfield, Calif. Two of these essays have already won awards, and the third is certainly as meritorious. I am sure that you will find them interesting, both because of what they have to say and because of the excellent way they are written.

The essays follow:

I AM AMERICA

(By Carol Smith)

(NOTE.—This essay won first place in the American Legion Auxiliary Essay Contest this year.)

I am America. My arms embrace 3,615,211 square miles of freedom and equality. My plains produce scores of provisions and necessities for my people. My mountains encompass vast and beautiful areas, rich with forests, housing an abundance of natural resources. Is this reason enough to stand with head high and chest swelled, because one is an American?

In my past are events which shook the world, events which long will remain first and foremost in the minds of not only Americans, but of people all over the world. Is this a heritage to be proud of?

Yes! On distant continents, in past ages, unrest dwelt in the hearts of men. Because of this, they explored uncharted regions, searching for a foundation upon which to build a country which all the world would come to place upon a pedestal. It would serve as an example of the coveted freedoms of which so many are deprived.

When my infant shores were settled by colonists, the settlers believed they would then be free to govern themselves. But, when they found that this was not true, they revolted, determined to make theirs the symbol of equality, such as the world had never known.

I am renowned throughout the world as a nation which guarantees equal rights to all men. For this reason, hundreds of thousands of people come to me each year, with hopes of a new and better life. I pray that I have been, and always will be, able to fulfill their hopes and dreams.

Thus, it is a union of these people that seek my shores, and these who have been born here, that they have made, and are still making me a symbol of all that men strive to achieve. During persecutions, during wars with alien forces, and during civil war these men have stood by me, fighting to keep what our forefathers died to obtain—the right of every man to have a say in how his life is to be run, and the chance, given to all, to become whatever they may.

From my soil have come these men and courage and valor, the like of which no country has ever borne. It was these men who lived, fought, and died to make me what I am today. To quote a phrase from Frances

Scott Key, "the land of the free, and the home of the brave." I am America!

TAMMI

(By Leah Ogden)

(NOTE.—This story won a Certificate of Merit for National Achievement in Creative Writing, by Scholastic Magazines.)

There is one main corral at the Dale-Mar Ranch. Standing at the top of the hill that overlooks the stable, you can see the dozen or so horses that are patiently standing behind its bars.

All but one: Tammi. Her glossy white coat gleams with health as it stands out against the nondescript browns and blacks of the other horses. "Tammi's Banner," as the stable hands have nicknamed her glorious tall, fans out in the brisk breeze that blows westerly. Her forelock blows in her eyes, and she gives her head a defiant little toss, you catch your breath. You know this is beauty unequalled by any other.

She struts out in front of the other mares as if to say, "Look at me!" Her youthfulness makes her playful and she snakes out her long neck to teasingly nip Dusty, the yearling sorrel colt.

You must get to her. Racing down the hill you feel the sharp sting of cold air as it hits your face. Slowing down, you take a deep breath, and the sweet smell of hay fills your nostrils.

You know exactly where her tack is. Reaching a long arm, you give the bridle a practiced glance and find it perfect. Again you run. You know you shouldn't; you'll startle the other horses, especially Mick. The temperamental old mare has never liked you anyway, and, as you pass her stall, she snorts. But you have no time for her now. Tammi is waiting.

Reaching the corral, your eyes immediately pick out Tammi. She has seen you, and her small delicate ears are raised in anticipation. Her impish brown eyes meet yours for a second, and, with a nicker of greeting, she trots forward. Her small Arabian head is stretched over the bars, and she waits for the treat she knows you have for her. Laughing, you stretch out your palm that holds the surprise. Soft lips reach delicately out to nibble the carrot, and your hand brushes her velvet nose.

Suddenly, Victory, the black gelding, flashes his nose over the gate. He nudges your hand, and Tammi squeals with rage. Reeling, she gives him a sharp kick that infuriates him. You stand outside frozen, and then move in to steady the mare. At your touch she quiets, and you lead her to the mounting block. Her dancing hooves tap out a staccato on the blacktop, as you swing up on her bareback. She crabsteps to the left, and gives you a little rear. You know she just wants to go, so you set off at a brisk trot that soon becomes a canter as you reach the trail. It is still early; you know you won't be back till noon. Tammi's rocking motion is soothing, and the beat on the turf is rhythmical. She's your horse now, and forever to come.

STRENGTH OF CHARACTER

(By Kate Steiner)

"I would rather die having spoken after my manner, than to speak in your manner and live."

I interpret this phrase quoted from Socrates to mean that each individual should have enough strength of character to be courageous enough to stand up for what he believes. Socrates stated that he would rather die than to go along with others who believe in something that is wrong.

Nearly 2,000 years ago, people known as martyrs died rather than to deny that they were followers of Christ. These people had strength of character enough to stand up for what is right, even if doing so meant death to them.

In today's society, I think there is even more of a responsibility to do what is right and not what would be "just for kicks." Young people today need to show more character. If more teenagers would stand up to wrong and then have the guts to say, "No," to what they deep down feel is wrong, then there would be fewer dope addicts, car accidents, motorcycle accidents and the like.

When teenagers realize that speeding is wrong and smoking and drinking will only harm them, when they can say, "No," then maybe they can get the freedom they "holler" for so much. For then they will have grown up, and the older generation will be able to trust them.

MEMORIAL DAY MESSAGE, 1968, BAY VILLAGE, OHIO, BY THE REVEREND JOHN W. OERTER

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor to share the platform at Memorial Day ceremonies in Bay Village, Ohio, which I represent, with the distinguished pastor of the Bay Presbyterian Church, the Reverend John W. Oerter.

His message was so timely, and so beautifully expressed, that I would like to share it with my colleagues in the Congress. The Reverend Mr. Oerter's words have deep significance for all Americans, and I am pleased to make them a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows: MEMORIAL DAY MESSAGE, 1968, BAY VILLAGE, OHIO

(By the Reverend John W. Oerter, Bay Presbyterian Church)

Two questions are appropriate for us to ask ourselves on this occasion: Why do we go through this annual ceremony, and what will come of it?

Does a little marching, do a few speeches, make us feel we have somehow done a patriotic duty? Are we trying to express our thanks to those who can no longer hear us? Are we trying to reduce our guilt that we are alive when some of our age are gone because they gave themselves for our freedom? Perhaps a few cling to the futile hope that the day's oratory will somehow generate significant momentum toward peace. It is possible that we are here to gain some new dedication to those high and elusive ideals to which this nation is theoretically committed. That's what a great President tried to do when he stood in a cemetery at Gettysburg. We need to do this because we can so easily become submerged in our private plans, partly because we feel there is so little we can do that will be felt in the great movements of the world community.

One-hundred and ninety-two years ago the shots were fired which announced with staccato authority that the colonies intended to be a nation. Since that year our nation has been tested by seven wars and is now slogging through an undeclared war which has divided our people as no other ever has. Our nation has been tested by depression and fantastic prosperity, by tensions between labor and management, and political parties which have often accused each other of treason. It has continued to grow until it is the wonder of the modern world, admired, envied and feared by other nations.

Now we face tests as crucial as any we have ever faced. It is still necessary for us to prove that we are dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. We

are groping for a guideline for a mission. We are powerful, but partly paralyzed by indecision concerning our role in the life of the world.

These times are something like those in which our nation was born, according to the description of Charles Dickens in introducing *The Tale of Two Cities*. "It was the best of times; it was the worst of times. It was the age of wisdom; it was the age of foolishness. It was the epoch of belief; it was the epoch of incredulity. It was the season of light; it was the season of darkness. It was the spring of hope; it was the winter of despair. We had everything before us; we had nothing before us."

Today we are threatened, not only by an atomic holocaust, but by worldwide restlessness which breaks out in protests that always are in danger of moving to anarchy. All of this without the strength which used to come from commonly held beliefs.

At the same time never has greater hope for a good life seemed more plausible. If modern technology and the power of the atom could be used for desalinization of sea water, for example, the ancient dream of the prophet could come true. "The desert shall blossom with the rose . . ." Not only the rose, but corn and cabbage, beets and broccoli, beans and bananas to feed the starving of the world.

Why aren't we doing this at a faster and more dramatic pace? We haven't found out how to live at peace and in the spirit of mutual generosity. The problem is not with the atom, but with the Adam. Man needs to be redeemed. This is a day for each of us to examine our basic commitments. Let each of us ask himself, "Do I have a religion or philosophy by which I can live creatively and for which I would die if necessary?"

There are enough confused people in the world, enough doubters, enough cynics who indulge in the fantasy that they can live a selfish life of comfort while the rest of the world goes down the drain. We need believers, passionate believers. If you have such a religion or philosophy then live it out in all areas of life. If you don't have such a religion or philosophy, waste no time in looking for one.

This rededication of ourselves to the cause of peace and freedom with justice is—it seems to me—a worthy tribute to those whom we salute today.

THEY SERVED AND WERE SERVED

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in launching a program last year to provide our returning veterans with maximum employment assistance, President Johnson said:

These veterans have served their country well. It is only right that their country serve them as well.

In communities across the country, those men and women who have served America so ably in the Armed Forces are getting a wide range of assistance from veterans employment representatives.

Through the aid of their Government, these returning veterans are being placed in jobs, receiving counseling, and being referred to training or educational programs.

There have been many success stories—like the disabled logger who became a logging supply salesman or the amputee catskiner who became a leatherworker. And there are many others.

To illustrate the invaluable employment assistance being rendered to these valiant Americans, I include an article from the Employment Service Review, "They Served and Were Served," into the RECORD, as follows:

THEY SERVED AND WERE SERVED

(By Stanley N. Foged)

"I guess I broke my pick."

That was the comment of a convalescing disabled veteran in the Portland, Oreg., Veterans Administration Hospital to a local office Veterans Employment Representative during one of the VER's regular hospital visits.

This veteran was talking about not being able to go back to his job of many years as a logger. The spinal fusion he had undergone just about disqualified him for any job in a logging camp.

The VER, Frank Walley, Jr., of the Portland Adult Opportunity Center, talked further with this patient, who soon showed he had a few good ideas on jobs he knew he could do and of some he wasn't so sure he could handle.

Out of this experience grew an idea, then a plan—the convalescence period, just before discharge from the hospital, would be an excellent time for disabled patients to think about and make plans for their future jobs.

And so, with the cooperation of the Social Service, Volunteer Service, and Psychological Service units and with the approval of the hospital administration, the first "Job Finding Techniques Training Session" was organized.

Each session is attended by six or eight patients under the guidance of Mr. Waller. Appropriate experts from the hospital and the Employment Service are called in as required. The patients are encouraged to express themselves and to converse on their mutual experiences and problems so that all can benefit. The main purpose of the group leader is to answer questions, help, guide, and stimulate discussion.

This program is now in full swing at the Portland VA Hospital. Popularity of the sessions has been responsible for increasing their frequency from once to twice a month, and plans are being made to add more sessions. Followup inquiries to the more than 100 veteran participants brought unanimous agreement that the sessions were helpful in preparing the patients for their subsequent job hunts. And there are success stories, too: The logger who became a logging supply salesman, the disabled truckdriver who took a job as a truck dispatcher, the amputee cat-skinner who became a leatherworker, and many more.

Not all veterans who need assistance are disabled. Howard W. West, State VER for Illinois, tells of a 27-year-old American Indian veteran who came to a Chicago Day Labor Office for a job so he could buy the tools he needed to take a better, skilled job. He was referred to the local VER, who learned that the young man could not purchase the needed tools on time, because he had no established credit. The VER contacted the Up-town Indian Center of the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Cook County Department of Public Aid, all without results. A call to the credit manager of Sears, Roebuck & Co. was successful. The young man was sent there for an interview and was granted \$200 credit to buy the tools and equipment, and the company gave him several articles free of charge. With his tools, the young Indian was then placed with the Mack Truck Co., where he is now employed.

Women veterans, although not in such vast numbers as the men, are given equal treatment by the Veterans Employment Service. State VER Robert E. Fecteau of Maine relates this case: A young female veteran was contacted by the local office during the veteran's followup program. When she

came into the local office, she was quite dejected because she had failed to find a job as a telephone operator. She felt she was well qualified because of her 3 years' experience in this work in the Army. She had, on her own, made quite a few applications and visits throughout the community in an effort to get a job, but with no success. The area had but a limited number of opportunities in this field of work, but the local VER decided to try some job development for the young lady. He called the local hospital, and the personnel director agreed to interview the girl—a week later she went to work there as a switchboard operator.

Also in Maine, a small upholstery shop is being successfully operated by a 50-year-old handicapped veteran, largely through efforts of the Employment Service and cooperation of other Government agencies. Seemingly, this man had just about everything going against him. He had received a medical discharge from the service in 1942, and is certified 30 percent disabled on the basis of neurosis by the Veterans Administration. He was a rehabilitated alcoholic who had been under psychiatric treatment for 2 years, with medical treatment for 2 years prior to that. So it was with great doubt that he was enrolled in an MDTA course for upholstery. But he completed the 24 weeks of training, and before long had set himself up in business with a \$500 loan from a credit union. But, since the business was on the second floor, in a poor building in a poor part of town, underfinanced and understocked, and lacked a truck for pickup and delivery, by the end of 6 months it was nearly on the rocks. Several contacts were made with other agencies, with no results, and finally the local bank was approached for a loan to finance the new business. The bank said no, and this refusal opened the way for a request for assistance from the Small Business Administration. In less than 2 months a loan of \$2,500 was delivered in person by an SBA representative. The business was saved, is now in a ground floor shop in a better location, and is flourishing.

In Pennsylvania, Joseph F. Welsh, State VER, reports this case among others: After 24 years with the same company, a World War II Purple Heart veteran found himself out of a job when the company transferred the entire activity to a distant city. This veteran had considerable self-confidence. He had been a senior insurance clerk and felt capable of stepping into a similar job without difficulty. However, he was just under the magic age of 45, when many companies hesitate to hire; his arm, while not disabled, did have restricted movement because of the shell fragment wounds he had received in service. So, with these problems, the placement people in the Clerical and Professional Office had much difficulty in locating a job for him.

Finally, it was decided that the veteran should take an MDTA course as a data processing technician, lasting a year. He finished this training in the upper 10 percent of his class and was eventually placed with Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., subject to passing a physical examination. The examination turned up a heretofore unsuspected hernia. Inasmuch as the position would require much walking and standing, such a defect would be disqualifying. The company proposed that, if the veteran had the hernia corrected by surgery, he could start to work after being released from the hospital. The veteran did this and was eventually put to work as a computer program trainee, opening up an entire new field of work for him.

HE CAME TO SAY "THANKS"

A veteran in North Dakota has returned to the local VER twice, not to get a job, but to say "Thanks." W. M. Williamson, North Dakota State VER, tells the story of this grateful young veteran: He finished the eighth grade in a one-room rural school when

nearly 16, and the only job he could get was as a farm laborer. He was a steady and conscientious worker who wanted to do better, but he was never able to break out, still earning only \$200 a month. When he turned 21, he was married and still struggling at \$1.26 an hour. Then he was drafted into the Army, where he became a lineman, climbing poles and stringing wire in Vietnam. Three days after his discharge from service he came into the local office. He needed a job, but he knew his limited education was a handicap. However, he wanted something better for his family. He wanted to be a lineman again, but he thought that here, too, they wanted only high school graduates. The local VER arranged for an interview at the local power company for a possible job as apprentice lineman, and the young veteran was hired—in a job with a future and a living wage.

Two North Dakota boys were started on their training to become journeyman carpenters through the efforts of the local office VER in the Grand Forks office of the Employment Service. Randall was a high school dropout with only limited work experience in unskilled occupations. While in the Army, he passed his General Education Development test and was trained as a wireman. He felt his only possibility of a future was in this area of work, but there were no openings. David had worked as a baker prior to his Army service. In the Army he was trained as a clerk. Neither of these jobs appealed to him. Both men came to the local office in Grand Forks, where they were counseled and tested, and informed of the various types of training available to them. Both chose apprenticeship training in carpentry, although Randall was reluctant until he was assured he would not be the only beginner of his age group in the class. Three weeks following the start of the training, the local VER visited the class. He found both veterans happy with their choice of work, and the instructors assured him that both were good students and would make competent carpenters.

It happened in Birmingham, and James C. Gates, the Alabama VER, tells of the impatient young Negro Vietnam veteran who came in expecting to criticize, but who a month later was all praise for the activities of the Youth Opportunity Center and his new job. He came to the local office on November 3, 1967 to file for a job and to find out about his servicemen's compensation privileges. After his claim for compensation was taken care of, he was interviewed by the local VER, who, on learning the veteran had been a medical corpsman, suggested referral to a number of local hospitals. He went first to the local VA hospital where he filled out an application as a nurse's assistant. This took up most of the day, and still there was no job. He went home and wrote a letter of complaint to the Department of Labor, criticizing the lack of information available. He didn't realize that possible jobs had to be searched out, developed. In a few days, the Youth Opportunity Center called him in for further counseling and gave him the General Aptitude Test Battery. Then an opening was developed at the University of Alabama Hospital as a nurse's assistant. He was referred, and on December 4 started work there. The hospital personnel officer suggested he take advantage of in-service and academic training available at the University Center. Later, this doubting, impatient veteran had a chance to praise the YOC and his new job as one of five YOC youths speaking before the chamber of commerce.

TRAINEES AND THEN PARTNERS

A recent news letter from the Colorado Department of Employment reveals a success story in which a 36-year-old veteran of the Air Force in Korea and a 45-year-old World War II veteran were helped by MDTA training in coin-machine repair, and became partners in business. They visited the local

Employment Service office in Greeley, saying they would like to attend the 24-week course in coin-machine repair in Denver, but they couldn't afford the tuition costs. After investigation, Joseph F. Evanoski, State VER for Colorado, was able to enter them in the course under MDTA in January 1967. Later, they inquired about possibly buying the school, and the owner was willing to sell. They formed a corporation and after some months were proprietors of the school. In the next few months, they were able to double their business and now have plans for further expansion. The coin-machine repair field is expanding rapidly and many now in the field are ready for retirement. The school now has students from 10 States and Canada, and has received job orders from as far away as Saigon, Guam, South Africa, and Alaska. These two men were transformed from insecure, middle-aged workers to men with a good productive future through a combination of the Employment Service, MDTA, and their own desires to achieve a secure future.

Part-time work can be helpful, too, as is shown in this story related by Walter S. Carlson, State VER for Minnesota. Steve, a 21-year-old just released from the Marines, had a service occupation as a closed circuit television operator and technician. His arrival at the local office coincided with a discussion in the psychology department of the St. Cloud VA Hospital concerning the need for just such a closed-circuit TV system operator and technician in that department. Steve was sent for an interview with Dr. Gordon Henley and was hired to start work the next day. He works 20 hours or more a week, and since January he has been attending St. Cloud State College.

The foregoing are only a few representative cases from around the country. Veterans come in daily to the local VER's for assistance in getting jobs. Some get jobs, others need further counseling, and still others require training or additional education to make them employable. There is no average case; some are able bodied, others are disabled—physically or mentally or both. They vary in age from 17 to 60. But whoever the individual is, the local VER gives the services that are needed and gains the cooperation of other local, State, and Federal agencies for whatever services are available. Sometimes, it may seem there is a bit of a Houdini in each local VER—it all helps.

RICHARD ROVERE'S ARTICLE ONE OF FINEST PIECES ON VIETNAM

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit for the reading of my colleagues one of the finest pieces on Vietnam which I have seen in a long time. The essay is by Richard Rovere and is entitled "Reflections: Half Out of Our Tree."

Mr. Rovere reviews our role in the Pacific since before World War II and on through the Korean war to our present efforts in Vietnam. While relating our present commitment to those we have engaged in in the past, he looks at what a precipitous withdrawal would mean in terms of the world's balance of power and our role in tomorrow's world. It seems to me that the American people must give great consideration to Vietnam in the context of our long-term history as well as to the immediate burdens it imposes.

Finally, Mr. Rovere questions how much longer the American people will

support the efforts required by Vietnam and by our role as leader of the free world.

Mr. Rovere's demanding and brilliant article from the October 28, 1967, issue of the New Yorker, follows:

REFLECTIONS: HALF OUT OF OUR TREE

"This is not 1948; L. B. J. is not Harry Truman; and Vietnam is not Korea."—From an editorial in the New Republic, September 30, 1967.

So say the liberal doves—or at least some among them who were adult and articulate in 1948 and 1950 and who must somehow square past and present. The younger dissidents need not trouble their minds or their consciences about what went on in the Dark Ages, but those over thirty-five or forty must in one way or another confront certain moral, political, and intellectual problems created for them by the views they held two decades ago. Consistency may be a mean virtue, but many people prize it highly and go to remarkable lengths to show others and themselves that they possess it.

It is always easier to deny than to establish the validity of any given historical analogy. If history really repeated itself, its study would be at once boring and terrifying. But analogy can have a limited validity and can, like metaphor, yield and enrich insights. Moreover, where a denial is so flat and emphatic, it is advisable to take a close, hard look. Why should anyone insist that "this is not 1948"? People are capable of keeping track of the years without assistance. Why bring up 1948 instead of 1964 or 1952—or, for that matter, 1776? Why not say that Lyndon Johnson isn't Calvin Coolidge or the Shah of Iran, and that the war in Vietnam isn't the Mexican War or the Wars of the Roses? Clearly, the two years, the two men, and the two sets of events that are mentioned together have, or appear to have, something in common. There is, as it happens, one quite striking way in which Presidential politics today very much resembles the Presidential politics of 1948. Then, as now, many liberal Democrats wished very much to be rid of a liberal Democratic President. Though in the end most of them probably voted for Harry Truman against Thomas E. Dewey, a few supported that year's "peace" candidate—Henry A. Wallace, who had recently resigned the editorship of the *New Republic*—and others, early in the year, had made strenuous efforts to get the Democratic Party to dump Truman and name as its candidate the then Chief of Staff of the United States Army, Dwight D. Eisenhower. (Improbable as it sounds, General Eisenhower might be described as the Robert Kennedy of 1948. General Eisenhower declined to become involved, although it is said that when he was approached on this matter by some leaders of Americans for Democratic Action, his response was that he would consider accepting the Democratic nomination if he could get the Republican one as well.) True, the motives of the 1948 liberals were quite different from those that spur today's liberals into disowning Johnson and contemplating support for a conservative Republican, provided he is less of a hawk than the President. The dump-Truman people did not hate the then President, they merely scorned him and feared that the Democratic Party could not win with him; what the dump-Johnson people fear is precisely the opposite—a Democratic victory that would keep the despised incumbent in office. The dump-Truman people, like everyone else, believed the opinion polls, and they didn't want to be stuck with a loser; the dump-Johnson liberals, also with an eye on the polls, don't want to be stuck with a winner.

"LBJ is not Harry Truman." In many ways, the two men are as different as John F. Kennedy and William Howard Taft. Johnson is a consummate politician; Truman was only a

persevering one. Truman was as artless as Johnson is artful. Truman was generally candid, and Johnson seems a compulsive dissembler. One could go on. Truman's foreign policy was widely admired and more often than not was successful, but in domestic policy he never got anywhere; Johnson has done quite well with domestic policy, but his foreign policy may lead us all to disaster. Still, Johnson in late 1967 has more in common with Truman in 1948 than the hostility of some of the same liberals. Both were once Democratic senators and Vice-Presidents. Each took office upon the death of a beloved predecessor. Johnson, like Truman, has never been a child of the Establishment. From the Eastern liberals' point of view, both came from the wrong, or South, side of the tracks. Both had meager, or at least unfashionable, schooling. Both have rather coarse manners and offend by indelicacy of speech. (Liberals, I have no doubt, consider themselves large-minded people, concerned with principles, not personalities. Some are large-minded, others not. If Kennedy had lived, he might at some point have called a halt to the escalation he began. He might even have found a way to get us out of Vietnam altogether. If he had lived and, as seems to me entirely possible, found no better solution than Johnson's, then, of course, he would have faced today much the kind of opposition that Johnson faces. But I cannot help believing that it would have been somewhat less widespread and more restrained against a Commander-in-Chief who was a Harvard man with uncommon wit, intellectual poise, a passion for excellence, and gallantry of manner. Kennedy just might have managed to run a slightly more tasteful and elegant war.) But the relevant thing is that Johnson is, as Truman was, a liberal Democratic President of the United States in serious trouble on almost every front.

Though Truman failed where Johnson has more or less succeeded, and vice versa, their policies are very similar, causing them to make the same enemies. Truman astonished everyone—including, I have always believed, himself—by winning in 1948, and the liberals, some of whom now seem to have forgotten that they ever opposed him, were gratified at being spared a Dewey Administration. A year and a half later, we were at war in Korea. There was some opposition to our intervention, but most of it came from isolationists, like Joseph P. Kennedy and Herbert Hoover. Little of it came from the liberals. Wayne Morse, J. William Fulbright, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and J. Kenneth Galbraith all had the public ear in those days, but none of these men were critical of our involvement—and neither, it may be well to say, was I, who now share with them a disapproval of our Vietnam policy. They were in varying degrees enthusiastic in their support of the Korean war, even when General MacArthur, with the full backing of his American superiors and with a special mandate from the United Nations General Assembly, escalated the war by invading North Korea—a step that is held by most historians to have brought the Chinese into the war. (It was believed by some at the time that the real cause of the Chinese belligerence in Korea was our support of Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa. Before our armies went north, there had been quite explicit—though, of course, ignored—announcements of a Chinese intention of intervening.) There was, to be sure, severe criticism, largely led by liberals, of MacArthur's subsequent politicking for further escalation, but that came after, not before, Administration policy had led to a greatly widened war. MacArthur's original move north—surely analogous to an invasion of North Vietnam today—was regarded as an altogether legitimate pursuit of altogether legitimate war aims.

"Vietnam is not Korea." They are two thousand miles apart and considerably different in climate, terrain, and demography.

Both, however, are relatively small and underdeveloped Asian countries partitioned into a Communist North and a non-Communist South by international agreements in the making of which they had no voice. Both about China, both are peninsular, and both have long histories of colonial occupation and oppression. Each has been the site of large-scale warfare, with the United States in each case intervening to assist the anti-Communist government of the Southern region, and with China assisting—on a very large scale in Korea and on what is still a small scale in Vietnam—the Communist regime in the North. There are other parallels and, of course, many divergencies. Of the latter, all but one—the very different relationships of Korea in 1950 and Vietnam today to Soviet and Chinese power—seem to me to bear only tangentially on the soundness of our present policy and the consistency of liberal thinking. In any consideration of these matters, we must, I think, begin with the incontrovertible fact that the two countries are on the same continent. In both cases, United States policy toward Asia has been at issue. This has been the key to the thinking of one American liberal, Walter Lippmann, who would have no difficulty in finding in the public record proof positive of his own consistency. Long before we became involved in the Korean war, Lippmann was arguing that this country had no business whatever deploying its troops on the mainland of Asia. At the time of Korea, he said that we should be involved, if at all, only as a sea and air power, and he has been saying the same thing about Vietnam for several years. In this, he is only invoking an established (though perhaps today disestablished) American doctrine, and, as a matter of fact, that doctrine was briefly in force even after President Truman and his advisers had committed us to the defense of South Korea on June 25, 1950.

Though it tends to be forgotten now, those who—in Blair House, on that important date—agreed that we ought to intervene had in mind giving the South Koreans only such support as our Navy and Air Force could supply. And for three days that was all we gave. It was not until President Truman was personally assured that General MacArthur, who had been up to then a leading member of the Lippmann school (he had once said that anyone who advocated the use of our ground forces in Asia “ought to have his head examined”), had changed his mind that he assented to the historic shift in policy. In Vietnam we have again tested the wisdom of the doctrine abandoned seventeen years ago, and to some its continuing essential soundness has again been demonstrated. But a much larger question is whether we have any business entering any Asian wars with any kind of American power. It is difficult to see how anyone could maintain that it was morally right to enter the one Asian war in 1950 and is morally wrong to be in the other one today. A more valid argument can be offered on the ground that what makes the one intervention defensible and the other indefensible is that in the interval between the two wars what we once called “international Communism” has been shown to be nonexistent. What in 1950 appeared to be “monolithic” is now revealed as “polycentric.” This is an enormously important and highly relevant development, but it does not really alter the basic question of what our role in Asia should be. Even if no Communist powers had been involved in either case, or if the ally of one Northern regime had been Communist and the ally of the other had been anti-Communist, it would still be necessary to decide how much responsibility this country should assume for a balance of power in Asia.

Do we, as a people, have any morally or politically legitimate concern with the political order in Asia? If we say no—or say perhaps, but not to the point of using

force—then we simply have to ask ourselves what on earth we were doing in Korea seventeen years ago, and even what we were fighting the Japanese about twenty-five years ago. (It will not do to say that they attacked us at Pearl Harbor. That would not have happened if our foreign policy had not seemed a threat to theirs.) For, beyond all the talk about Fascism and Imperialism and Communism and democracy and self-determination, the basic reality is that, for bad reasons or good, the United States has increasingly, through most of this century, been throwing its weight around in Asia to create or maintain a political order that several American governments have decided is best for the United States and possibly best for Asia. I happen to think we would all be far better off if this decision had never been taken by anyone, but it was taken—and not by Lyndon Johnson in late 1963 or early 1964. The balance of power—that is what our three Asian wars have been about, and we might as well state the rest of this proposition, which is that this is what all foreign policy is and almost always has been about. If we ask ourselves why we shouldn't leave the balance of power in Asia to the Asians, we might as well reopen the question of whether we have, or ever had, any business messing about with the balance of power in Europe or anywhere else in the world or the cosmos. I can think of several quite compelling arguments for having different European and Asian policies, but I cannot see how the war in Vietnam can be regarded as some new and lamentable departure from established policy. Rather, it appears to me an application of established policy that has miscarried so dreadfully that we must begin examining not just the case at hand but the whole works. If this is where our foreign policy lands us, then we had better settle among ourselves whether the policy is, or ever was, any good, and even whether we ought to have any foreign policy at all.

For most liberals, the real clincher is that, as they see it now, in Korea we opposed an act of clear and premeditated aggression carried out by an army crossing an international boundary and seeking to annex by force the territory on the other side, whereas in Vietnam we are interfering in what is essentially a civil war, with the forces we oppose consisting of indigenous rebels. There is something in this, but, in my view, very little, and nothing, certainly, to destroy the strength of the analogy. In Korea, it was plainly a matter of troops from the North marching into the South. The people in the Southern war zones seemed to feel very little sympathy for the invaders, whereas in Vietnam the Vietcong guerrillas and, possibly to a lesser extent, the regulars from the North have a good deal of support. But this hardly demonstrates that one is a civil war and the other was not. Koreans fought Koreans in Korea, as Vietnamese are fighting Vietnamese in Vietnam. In each case, the issue was control of the Southern territory and unification of the country. In each case, the contested area has been part of the homeland of people with a more or less common history. Indeed, one can argue that the partition of Vietnam into Northern and Southern regions has greater historical justification than the similar partition of Korea. Many historians maintain that the cultural and political differences between North and South in Vietnam are large and ancient ones, difficult to resolve under one government. “By 1620,” according to John T. McAlister, Jr., a Princeton authority on Southeast Asia, writing in *World Politics* for January, 1967, “the system had succumbed to regional pressures, and Vietnam had become divided into two warring states, literally separated by a wall built across the width of the country at the eighteenth parallel near the town of Dong Hoi, north of

Hue.” This seventeenth-century anti-infiltration barrier, McAlister goes on, was “constructed by the leaders of the southern faction, the Nguyen family, [and] rose to a height of eighteen feet. . . . [In] 1672 it proved strong enough to withstand a major military test by the northern faction under the generalship of the Trinh family.”

Korea had known partitions since 108 B.C. Nevertheless, Edwin O. Reischauer writes that it “is a more homogeneous national unit than are most of the countries of South Asia.” As for the “boundary” at the Thirty-eighth Parallel in Korea, though it had been proposed as a line of demarcation between Russian and Japanese spheres of influence following the war in 1905, the State Department used to describe it as a “fortuitous line resulting from the exigencies of war.” Secretary of State James Byrnes had in 1947 called it “a military convenience.” In any event, Americans should be the last people to say that a civil war is not a civil war when it is primarily regional in character or can more or less accurately be described as a War Between the States.

In his forthcoming “Memoirs: 1925-1950,” George F. Kennan, who was director of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff until late in 1949, writes of Korea, “This was, finally, a civil conflict, not an international one; and the term ‘aggression’ in the usual international sense was as misplaced here as it was to be later in the case of Vietnam.” Kennan nevertheless approved our intervention—indeed, thought it an inescapable duty. Until the end of the war, Korea had been a Japanese colony. We accepted the Japanese surrender in the Southern zone. But in 1950, he says, “There was as yet no peace treaty with Japan to define [Korea's] future status. We had accepted the responsibilities of military occupation in South Korea, and the fact that we had withdrawn our own combat forces did not mean, in the continued absence of a Japanese peace treaty, that these responsibilities were terminated. We had a perfect right to intervene, on the basis of our position as occupying power, to assure the preservation of order in this territory.” Here is a distinction between the two wars that is also an important difference.

Kennan—who, incidentally, opposed the bombing of North Korea, as today he opposes the bombing of North Vietnam—felt that we should have gone ahead in Korea without bringing in the United Nations, whose involvement, as he saw it, itself became a cause of heightened tensions. Most of today's older doves, however, maintain that the backing of the U.N. gave the earlier war the legitimacy that the present one lacks. Few things about the situation in which we now find ourselves should give us more concern than the fact that today we clearly do not enjoy the good opinion of much of mankind. But if the truth is to be told, we didn't enjoy it in the early fifties, either. The U.N. support was largely illusory and came about through dumb luck. The Russians had absentmindedly—and providentially, from our point of view—boycotted the U.N. Security Council, and were thus unable to veto the resolution of support. Had there been a Russian veto, the United States would have gone ahead without U.N. support. We were already in the war.

Furthermore, the Security Council resolution was something less than an unequivocal call to arms. It called for a cease-fire and asked U.N. members to “render every assistance” in bringing one to pass. In a book on the war published in 1951 (originally issued as “The General and the President” and reissued in 1965 as “The MacArthur Controversy”), Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and I wrote, “By putting the broadest possible construction on this, the President was able to say that his decision was in furtherance of United Nations policy. This claim gave rise to a wrangle that still goes on in law schools.” Though Dean Rusk is no doubt right in say-

ing that "the proportion of non-United States forces in South Vietnam is greater than [that of] non-United States forces in Korea," we did have a good deal more approval in 1950 than we have in 1967. But most of it came in the form of talk. Even those nations, like England, that gave us some military assistance were scared stiff that we might lead them into a world war, and kept beseeching us to get out of Korea on the best terms we could—which, in the end, was what we did.

The Communist nations and the radical parties everywhere accused us, as they do today, of conducting an imperialist crusade. If the war in Vietnam is in some sense "imperialist," as so many Americans have come to believe, so was the war in Korea. In any event, the ultimate soundness of a policy is not to be determined by who supports it and who does not. This is particularly the case when, as in the U.N., the count is of nation states. The fact that a majority of General Assembly members has regularly opposed the admission of mainland China does not lend any moral or political force to the wisdom of mainland China's exclusion. The fact that the Organization of American States voted overwhelmingly support, *ex post facto*, of the American intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 has never been regarded as an acceptable sanction for the dispatch of troops.

In Korea, as in Vietnam, our intervention was undertaken on the President's initiative. War was never declared by Congress. Truman lacked even as questionable a mandate as the one that Congress gave Johnson in the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Dean Rusk can lecture congressmen today about our obligations under the SEATO treaty, but the treaty had not even been thought of in Dean Acheson's day. Yet I pick up an anti-war manifesto signed by many people who to my certain knowledge favored the Korean intervention and find them saying that because "Congress has not declared a war, as required by the Constitution," the war in Vietnam is "un-Constitutional and illegal." For my part, I would be happy if the Supreme Court ruled the war un-Constitutional next Monday morning.

But I cannot imagine a theory of the war or of the Constitution that would hold our presence in Vietnam to be in violation of our fundamental law and would not require the same judgment on our earlier presence in Korea. Nor can I see that it would make much difference if Congress did declare the existence of a state of war or if the Supreme Court certified the carnage as Constitutional. Can any legislature turn an unjust cause into a just one by an observance of due process? Slavery was "Constitutional" until it was smashed in a war of dubious Constitutionality. The signers of this anti-war manifesto were brought together by, they say, a common desire to assist young men in avoiding conscription. A worthy purpose it may well be, but the draft is legal; the Selective Service Act has been in force for twenty-seven years, and the Supreme Court has yet to strike it down. Such sticklers for law might consider turning themselves in for sedition and conspiracy. I find the names of some of them also attached to an appeal calling upon other citizens to join them and Henry David Thoreau—part of whose "Civil Disobedience" is used as the manifesto for this particular group—in withholding from the Internal Revenue Service that part of their taxes which, by their calculations, "is being used to finance the war." The income-tax laws are at least as legal and Constitutional as Selective Service. Thoreau didn't want to help pay for the Mexican War, which may have been, as he passionately believed it was, immoral, but it was certainly not illegal or un-Constitutional. Anyway, a "legal" war is a legal fiction.

The rhetoric of politics is always opportunistic. But war, which debases all discourse, makes it worse. The opportunism of

the doves is no more to be censured than that of anyone else. If I could stop the war by talking, I would not mind talking nonsense or telling a few lies. I have brought up the whole question of the Korea-Vietnam analogy because I think it is important for all of us to see that there have been some profound changes in us as well as in the world in the last two decades. To begin with, I think, the mere passage of time has had its effect. In 1950, with a great war only five years behind us, we had, as a people, the zeal and energy of crusaders. There was then little dissent—and, compared with today, little cause for dissent—from the proposition that militarized Communism threatened the peace and stability of the world and that it was up to us, newly emerged as a superpower, to turn back its sorties with whatever force was called for. We did so, and I have no doubt that if the circumstances that had obtained in the late forties or early fifties were to obtain at present in Vietnam, most of today's doves would support our role in Vietnam with at least as much vigor as they supported our role in Korea. But the *New Republic* is in a way profoundly right in insisting that things aren't the same.

Much has happened in the Communist world that requires us to rethink our positions, but even if this were not so we could not look upon Vietnam today as we once looked upon Korea. Our crusading zeal has ebbed; affluence, much of it spent on education, has been accompanied by a heightened sophistication about the world and its affairs, a spreading skepticism and disenchantment, and, in the middle class, a new and rather strange hedonism that particularly and peculiarly affects the young.

We are not, I think, a more attractive people than we were—rather, the contrary—but we are in many ways less self-righteous. Both the best and the worst spirits among us are turning inward more than they were before, given more to seeking individual grace and salvation—the consequences being, on the one hand, an admirable willingness to work and sacrifice on behalf of the disadvantaged and, on the other hand, a less admirable self-indulgence that increases the demand for everything from drugs to yachts and sports cars, from unrestricted sexual license to the right to behave as obnoxiously and irresponsibly as one's underdeveloped conscience may dictate. The difference between the two periods was well stated by Richard F. Babcock, a Chicago attorney, in a letter written early last year to an influential newspaper columnist. After describing what seemed to him the parallels between Korea and Vietnam, he wrote:

"There is, then, little difference, morally, strategically, or politically, between Korea in 1950 and Vietnam in 1966. Yet the first was and still is regarded as a demonstration of American moral stamina at its best, the latter as a moral and strategic aberration."

"The difference, I suspect, is that we are at 1966 and not 1950. There is, for example, a temporal relation between the domestic civil-rights struggle and Vietnam. The student who protests both racial discrimination and Vietnam is not irresponsible in his motivations—he is consistent. We are in an era of incredible affluence and, consequently, of sensitive national conscience in matters not only domestic but foreign. We are a generation away from World War II. Korea had no Watts. Korea was, however, only five years from Nuremberg and at the doorstep of McCarthy."

"This historical setting, it seems to me, is the key. And if so, it suggests that responsible critics do a disservice to the country when they fail to point out that Vietnam suffers not from a failure to come up to a moral or strategic imperative but that it takes place at a time when America is in a period of self-appraisal absent in 1950."

It is often said that the prevalence of television has done much to change us, particularly in our ways of responding to such

phenomena as war, racial injustice, and violence, and to the personalities of public men. It would be surprising if this were not to some extent so. The war in Vietnam is close to the center of the national consciousness because of the ease with which we can "follow" it—"live," or almost. Because of television, it is impossible to be unaware of, and hence indifferent to, the war, as the people of the European colonial powers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were largely unaware of the prolonged and costly campaigns—many of them much like the war in Vietnam—being carried on by their armies and navies in distant parts of the world.

I also think it likely that, as some people believe, the daily cocktail-time spectacle of death and atrocity (I sat down to dinner a few evenings ago just as C.B.S. was showing some American troops cutting the ears off Vietcong corpses as souvenirs of the combat) has contributed to the spreading revulsion and to anti-war sentiment. To argue this case, however, it would seem necessary to explain how it happens that a people with an enormous appetite for violence on television, in movies, and in highbrow as much as in low- and middlebrow literature may be repelled by a few minutes a day of the real thing, which is very often less sickening than the simulated variety.

This would be no problem for Norman Mailer or H. Rap Brown, each of whom tells us that we are and always have been a violent people and that the televised war in Vietnam satisfies our lust for violence and serves as a graduate school in murder for our young men. I reject this view. Despite our lynchings, gang wars, race riots, and casual military undertaking, I do not think our people are particularly given to violence. They are human beings and have their share of human weaknesses, of which a lust for violence has always been one. If violence is as American as apple pie, it is also as French as *quiche Lorraine*. There have been as many attempts on the life of Charles de Gaulle as on the lives of all the American Presidents put together. It may be that our assassins are better shots or that the French *Sûreté* is smarter than our Secret Service. In any case, I have been in many parts of the world where violence, organized and unorganized, is far more easily provoked than as a rule it is here, and far more a part of everyday existence.

I do not know why our popular culture is so hung up on violence and sadism. I think it may have less to do with the need for violence than with the third-rateness of the culture and with the kind of talent that turns out all this awful stuff. That is to say, a partial explanation may be that violence, like sentimentality, lends itself to easy exploitation. A stupid or lazy dramatist can save himself a lot of hard work by writing scenes in which the action consists of people maiming one another. An exchange of gunfire can be more easily and convincingly dramatized than a clash of human wills. And, of course, people go for it—but not just Americans.

Ours is a culture largely manufactured for export, and the very worst of it is a smash hit all over the world. But just as the carnality of our popular culture does not prove that we are more libidinous than others, its emphasis on violence does not prove that we are more brutish than others. Furthermore, there is to be observed an almost complete disjuncture between the violence of Vietnam and the violence of our cinematic and electronic fantasies. Although war movies like "The Dirty Dozen" are big at the box office, the most topical of wars, Vietnam, has yet to be the subject of a motion picture.

This, we are told, on excellent authority, is not because the producers are reluctant to exploit it. The subject has been deliberately avoided, it seems, for reasons rather like those behind the avoidance—at least, until recently—of the subject of sodomy and miscegenation. It would offend the audience, or a

good part of it, and in acknowledgment of this fact—presumably established by the usual surveys of the market—the major producers have agreed among themselves to lay off. Even as heady a matching of star and subject as John Wayne and the Army Special Forces has had difficulty attracting the capital needed for a picture to be called "The Green Berets." If, à la Norman Mailer, President Johnson is only John Wayne in the White House, he may be more vulnerable than we know.

As a nation among nations, as a force in the world, we may be behaving more chauvinistically today than we have ever behaved in the past. This almost has to be true, because our power is so immense that any ugly display of it makes an impression commensurate with its magnitude. But among us, as a people, chauvinism and jingoism have been declining steadily since the First World War. Although Hitler's Germany was more detestable than Kaiser Wilhelm's, there was less Hun-hating in the Second World War than in the First. What was "liberty cabbage" in 1918 was sauerkraut in 1945. There was not much flag-waving in the Second World War, and still less in the Korean war. But now we seem to have made a really radical break with the past.

This is the first war of the century of which it is true that opposition to it is not only widespread but fashionable. It is the first in connection with which it seems is downright bad taste to invoke patriotism; while the Korean war was still in progress, theatres were showing such movies about it as "A Yank in Korea," "Korea Patrol," "Glory Brigade," "Battle Circus," and "Mission Over Korea." In the two wars before this one, there was a conspicuous shortage of martial airs; and now, for the first time, popular songs of bitter protest, such as Joan Baez's "Saigon Bride" and Pete Seeger's "Waste Deep in the Big Muddy," are part of the popular culture.

If we could gauge a nation's penchant for violence by its official rhetoric and its popular culture, China would stand first in both categories. In the rhetoric department, we would rank far down the list and in popular culture perhaps second or third, though it is not to be forgotten that many others consume our product exactly as we do. Some Chinese are behaving very strangely these days, but I do not for a moment believe they are an abnormally violent people, and I am not so sure their leaders are more violent than ours. They just talk rougher and beat more people up. The medium is not the message. The message I get from my eyes and ears is that, because of this war and certain attendant miseries, kookiness of every sort is alarmingly on the rise.

At the same time, if it's a sign of one's sanity to be against the war, and a sign of relative sanity to prefer a limited war to the world's last great shoot-out, we are in better shape than many of us know. Consider the extraordinary extent of the opposition to this war—over forty per cent of the American people now, with the number increasing each month—and, perhaps equally notable, the distaste for it among those who do not oppose it. Nothing like this has been known in this century. Ordinarily, in this and most other modern states, opposition to war evaporates once the decision to wage it has been taken, once the killing has begun.

When the bugles sound and the colors are unfurled, almost everyone becomes a patriot of the Stephen Decatur, or my-country-right-or-wrong, persuasion. Such patriots seem very scarce today, and they speak softly, if at all. In the Senate there are a handful of screaming eagles, but mostly there are old-school politicians—like Senator Russell, of Georgia—who explain in patient, weary voices that we have to get on with the war because, regardless of the merits of the enterprise, we are in it and have committed our troops and our honor to it. Here is a terse

description of the extraordinary state of affairs in the United States Senate today—a summary, by C.B.S., of a mid-October survey it conducted:

"On Vietnam, the U.S. Senate is advising more and consenting less. In the C.B.S. News survey, nearly half the senators responding said they disapproved the conduct of the war. Open support for the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution dropped dramatically. Eighteen senators wanted the bombing of North Vietnam completely stopped.

"We talked with 95 senators. Eight of them refused to participate, 87 responding to the questions on the conduct of the war. Three years ago, President Johnson took a survey of his own. It was called the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, supporting his authority to do anything necessary in Southeast Asia. Eighty-eight approved then, two did not. Today, only 34 are prepared to publicly support a Tonkin Resolution without reservation or change. Fifteen refused to comment, and where two voted against it in 1964, 20 would now vote no.

"On Vietnam today, 42 senators disapprove the Administration's conduct of the war. Thirty-two approve. Eleven would not commit themselves, including the Senate's Minority Leader, Everett Dirksen. His 'no comment' follows strong defense of the President on the floor. Disapproval takes two directions. Fifteen are dissatisfied because they want more military action to end the war. Twenty-seven want less, in the form of bombing pauses or de-escalations.

"Most senators feel their constituents think as they do, 46 reporting the folks at home disapprove the handling of the war, 22 reporting constituent approval. They notice a recent change in their public's opinion, too. Thirty-three of the senators say their people have shifted, and 28 of them say it is in the direction of wanting less military action.

"On bombing policy, the Senate goes in all directions. Eighteen want bombing of the North completely stopped. Twenty-one say it should be increased, to include more lucrative targets. Twenty-four go along with whatever the President or the military want to do, and 12 suggest less bombing or a pause.

"The sleeper question of the survey turned out to be the last one, asking if the senators favored direct negotiations with the Vietcong. There was more agreement on this than anything else. Forty-six senators said yes. Sixteen said no to direct talks with the guerrilla front. One of them wanted a military victory so complete as to have no Vietcong to negotiate with.

"Many answers to the CBS News survey were qualified, justifying the opinion of several senators that polls never really satisfy with a full measurement of attitudes, but three things do emerge: a crumbling of the solid front support given three years ago with the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, an infectious restlessness in the Senate and among its constituents with the progress of the war, and a growing impatience with a long twilight struggle where victories do not decide, and the end cannot be seen."

Whether or not they mean it, the leaders of the Administration miss no opportunity to wring their hands and insist that it is peace, and not victory, they seek, and that they are ready at any time to sit down with anyone anywhere, and so on. ("I would depart today for any mutually convenient spot," Rusk said, "if I could meet a representative of North Vietnam with whom I could discuss peace in Southeast Asia.") Do they mean it? Who knows? If they don't mean it, why are they saying it? If they didn't talk so much, the credibility gap might narrow. But they go on. Week after week, the Secretary of Defense, the master of the greatest war machine in history, seems to be trying to signal to us, his countrymen, that the damned thing isn't working, that the bomb-

ing is pointless, that it should be stopped. Does he speak for the President? Evidently not, but he still has the job. As for the President, speaking of mankind's behavior in this century, he said earlier this month, in Williamsburg, Virginia, "We can take no pride in the fact that we have fought each other like animals." He added that it "is really an insult to the animals, who live together in more harmony than human beings seem to be able to do." After some generalizations on other failures of statesmanship, he said, "Shame on the world and shame on its leaders." Those who support the war, like those who oppose it, appeal not to the patriotic heart but to the bleeding one. This is without precedent.

Consider, also, the attitudes toward civilian deaths, and casualties, and the general human suffering brought by the war to the Vietnamese, North and South. These, too, are without known precedent. Whether this war is like or unlike any earlier one, it resembles all modern wars in that noncombatants are killed, the innocent suffer greatly, and there is much cruel and needless destruction. In Korea, we bombed and shelled villages, killed countless women and children. No Senate committees pestered the generals to learn how many civilians had been killed or what steps were being taken to avoid the slaughter of the innocents. *C'est la guerre.*

We killed a great many civilians in the Second World War. If they were Germans or Japanese, it served them right. (Hiroshima produced some immediate revulsion, but it was the newness and hideousness of the weapon employed that affected us, who had been little moved by wider killing with mere TNT.) If they were Italians or Frenchmen, we thought of their deaths as gallant sacrifices they made happily for the liberation of their soil. To be sure, civilized people have always felt that noncombatants should be spared to the greatest extent consistent with military needs, but until now there was no doubt in anyone's mind that the military needs—provided, of course, they were our own—should be the first consideration. Any sense of outrage over atrocities and dead civilians was directed at the enemy. Now, for the first time, the conscience of a large part of the nation has been aroused by agonies for which our own forces are responsible.

All wars are brutalizing, and perhaps in the random violence of the past few years (not merely the riots—not even so much the riots as the murders and assassinations) we are paying part of the price for sanctioned murder in the name of anti-Communism, self-determination, and democracy. But what seems already clear—from the size of the anti-war movements, from the muting of the eagles, from the outrage over atrocities and civilian losses—is that there is building up in this country a powerful sentiment not simply against the war in Vietnam but against war itself, not simply against bombing in Vietnam but against bombing anywhere at any time for any reason, not simply against the slaughter of innocents in an unjust conflict but also against the slaughter of those who may be far from innocent in a just conflict. The youthful protesters would probably acknowledge this without hesitation, only asking themselves why anyone should labor the point so heavily. (Some would no doubt go further, and say that they oppose not only the wars this government runs but everything else it does.)

Their elders, thinking of a past they find it necessary to be true to, cannot turn pacifist overnight. They must distinguish between this war and the wars they have supported in the past—up to and including the war in the Middle East a few months ago. But in fact our present war is different mainly in that it seems endless and hopeless.

Is it possible for us to come through this experience, if we come through at all, as a pacifist nation? I suppose not. "Pacifist nation" seems a contradiction in terms. If all

of us, or most of us, were pacifists, we would have little reason to be a nation. Defense is the fundamental *raison d'être* for the modern state. And if a pacifist nation didn't come apart at the seams, some nonpacifist nation would tear it apart. It seems to me, though, that if the war goes on and if opposition to it continues to increase at the present rate, there will in time be a testing of this whole proposition. No government that is not totalitarian can go on indefinitely fighting a hard war that its people hate. Something has to give. Either the government yields to the popular will or it becomes oppressive and stifles the protest by terror. Thus far, there is no sign that our government has faced the question. With very few exceptions, as far as the anti-war movement is concerned, police power has been used sparingly and in the interests of domestic tranquility.

Few other governments, even when they were not at war, would be as restrained as this one has been in dealing with protest movements, including violent ones. It seems to me that this is in part because we are waging the Vietnam war with an essentially professional military force. Its morale is said to be high and not to be much affected by what is going on here. This state of affairs cannot last indefinitely. Morale will be affected, and then the test will be made. I cannot figure the odds on the outcome. On the one hand, repression is the safest, surest, cheapest course for any government to take. I can imagine the coming to power of an American de Gaulle, or even of someone a lot more authoritarian than de Gaulle. Much of the troublemaking in the months and years ahead will be the work of Negroes, and I can even imagine the imposition of a kind of American apartheid—at least in the North, where Negroes live in ghettos that are easily sealed off.

If there should be the will to do it, it could be done quite "legally" and "Constitutionally." There are enough smart lawyers around to figure out how. On the other hand, there is unprecedented opposition to the war inside the odious "power structure" itself. There is much opposition in Congress and in every department of the federal government. The governors of large states and the mayors of great cities—among them the Mayor of New York—are opposed to the war. The Supreme Court, which was such a bastion of liberty in the McCarthy years, would make things as hard as possible for all the smart lawyers. The government could, of course, ignore, or even abolish, the Supreme Court. But the Court is not the only American institution that has proved quite resilient in periods of stress.

The churches, the press, the universities—all are centers of dissent. It could prove to be crucial that the American middle class—as despicable as the Establishment in the minds of the young and alienated—is also a center of dissent. The proletariat may not be willing to call off strikes or accept pay cuts because of the war, but it offers little support to the protest movements. If we are now undertaking, or are about to undertake, a radical alteration in values, support for it will come not from the workers but from an unproclaimed, and even unwanted, alliance between relatively affluent whites, of whom I happen to be one, and what Daniel P. Moynihan calls the "underclass," consisting mainly of unemployed Negroes, many of whom want to kill me.

I want American democracy to survive. It is in many ways a fraud. It is not keeping its promises to the American Negroes. It has abused them and many other people. It has very little aesthetic or intellectual appeal. But under it there is at least a hope of redemption. Things do get done here that don't get done under other systems. But it now seems clear to me that if American democracy does survive it will be something

quite different from what we have known. I find it hard at this stage to see how a victory for democracy will not also be a victory for pacifism.

Those who will lead the struggle are, whether they acknowledge it or not, renouncing war as an instrument of policy. They may insist that of course they would fight the enemy at the gates, or perhaps take arms against a new Hitler if one should arise. But the wars of the future—at least, those that would have any ideological content—are not going to be like the wars of the past. India and Pakistan or India and China may fight over bits and pieces of territory, but the Soviet Union and the United States are agreed on the need for common efforts to cool it when such disputes get hot. Most future wars are apt to be like the war in Vietnam—wars that will be called by their instigators "wars of national liberation." The Soviet Union, as Nikita Khrushchev long ago informed us, will support them. From its point of view, they are irresistible.

They cost next to nothing and drive us Americans out of our minds. But if we survive as anything like a free society, we will not be entering them. I simply cannot imagine this country, under any President chosen in a free election, taking on another Vietnam. If this is so, it may be good news. But it means that we won't have much in the way of a foreign policy. We will draw back from all difficult situations. We will leave the field to those who have not renounced war.

I hold a kind of Tolstoyan view of history, and believe that it is hardly ever possible to determine the real truth about how and why we got from here to there. Since I find it extremely difficult to uncover my own motives, I hesitate to deal with those of other people, and I positively despair at the thought of ever being really sure about what has moved whole nations and whole generations of mankind. No explanation of the causes and origins of any war—of any large happening in history—can ever be for me much more than a plausible one, a reasonable hypothesis. But if we cannot answer the "how" and "why" questions with anything like certitude, we can answer a good many of the "what" ones, and this sometimes enables us to eliminate at least some of the suggested "how's" and "why's." In regard to Vietnam, I feel confident in isolating certain noncauses and non-origins. We did not go into Vietnam spilling for a war. It was not the American attitude at the Geneva Conference in 1954 that made what everyone now speaks of as the "Geneva agreements" unworkable.

A far more likely thesis is that they proved unworkable because the Russians gave the French (and the South Vietnamese) better terms than they needed to, in the expectation that the French would on this account decide not to enter the proposed European Defense Community. However that may be, those so-called agreements were not a diplomatic settlement of any kind but simply a document setting forth the terms of a cease-fire. To quote John McAlister again:

"There were only three documents signed at Geneva, and only four signatories were involved: France, the royal governments of Laos and Cambodia, and the Vietminh. [The Vietminh was an army, not a government. What we think of as the South Vietnamese, or anti-Communist Vietnamese, were never consulted.] These agreements were not treaties and they were not formally ratified by any government by any process. They were simply agreements between the opposing military commands to stop the fighting in Indo-China and to take measures to prevent the fighting from being resumed. Some confusion has resulted because the 'Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference,' which 'noted' the key provisions of the various cease-fire agreements, seemed to emanate from all nine conference participants. However, this 'Final

Declaration' was not signed by any of the participants. It was yet another cold-war device to mask the lack of consensus among the major powers—an 'unsigned treaty'."

We have sinned greatly and frequently since 1954, but not always in the ways that we think we have. We did not go into Vietnam hoping for a war; after all, we had just passed up a splendid opportunity to join the fighting with our then friends the French at our side. But we were not taken altogether by surprise at discovering that nothing really had been settled by Geneva. Two-fifths of our aid in the early days was military, but something beyond this figure persuades me that we were after something a bit more decent than the opening of a new firing range. The non-Communist state that came into being as a consequence of the Geneva Conference looked to our foreign-aid people as if it might actually work, as if it might turn out to be a nice, prosperous, well-behaved little democracy. In the bright light of hindsight, this seems a ridiculous dream. And what may have been ridiculous about it was not that people like the Emperor Bao Dai and Ngo Dinh Diem would never let it happen, but, rather, that Ho Chi Minh would never let it happen.

We are always being told what awful people we have supported in Saigon while all along there has existed the alternative of supporting the Vietnamese Thomas Jefferson, Ho Chi Minh, and having him on our side. Ho sounds a lot more attractive than most of the types we have lately been dealing with, and it might have been very smart of us back before 1950, say, to try to strike up some sort of deal with him. And Ho could not have been much interested in us in the early fifties (and anyway think of what McCarthy would have said), and Diem then did not have, or was concealing, his cloven hoof. Diem never seemed a Thomas Jefferson, or even a Lyndon Johnson, but he looked no worse than our man in Korea, Syngman Rhee. And one can at least advance the hypothesis that our troubles have grown not out of Diem's "failure" and ours to create a good society in South Vietnam but out of a certain amount of early success, or, if not that, out of Ho's fear that we might somehow succeed someday. It could also be that he was not unmindful of the possibilities for looting.

The Americans had put a good many desirable things—including a lot of expensive and well-made weaponry—in South Vietnam, and if he could knock over the government without too much difficulty they would all be his.

Senator Fulbright has been saying for years that foreign aid is dangerous, because it can lead to war. I think he is right. We invest money and, more important, hope in a country, and when some thugs threaten to wreck the country and dash its hopes and ours we are tempted to police the place.

Some of the most promising governments in Africa are likely to go to pieces because the leaders of less hopeful neighboring states either can't stand the thought that the people across the way are going to make it or feel that neighbors ought to share and share alike. In the late fifties and early sixties, many Americans who had no appetite for war and no thought that there would be one urged that we give Saigon enough military assistance to put down the Vietcong and enable the government at least to stand on its feet and have enough time and energy to make something of itself.

They should have known better. But there was no reason then to think of the difficulties with the Vietcong as having much to do with the balance of power in Asia. Indeed—and here, perhaps, is another important difference between this war and Korea—it seems to have been our intervention on a large scale that gave the war a real balance-of-power meaning. In the early sixties, when Laos was a more troublesome place than Vietnam, the Russians were look-

ing the other way. In that period, too, the "domino theory" was generally discredited. There may then have been a chance for a President to reappraise—agonizingly, of course—the whole affair and order a phase-out. Vietnam was still an obscure place, and with us no longer involved it would have been still more obscure.

I speak of a time when Kennedy was alive. He could probably have de-escalated, but instead he escalated. If he had lived, and if he had beaten Goldwater or some other Republican in 1964, he might have altered his strategy at some later point. But he died, and Johnson pursued his policy with a vengeance, thereby, in my view, giving the domino theory a strange validity it had earlier lacked: *The dominoes might fall in a certain way because we set them up that way.* If we had got out of Vietnam five years ago, the balance of power in Asia might have been affected only insignificantly and imperceptibly. If we got out tomorrow, the consequences might be very serious indeed. We have painted ourselves in.

Until early in 1965, I felt that our role in Vietnam was defensible. The rulers of the country seemed an untrustworthy lot, but that did not appear a good reason for turning the place over to the Vietcong. Knowing that a developing nation cannot possibly manage war and reform at the same time without assistance, I felt that our assistance in putting down an insurgency was helpful. The fact that the insurgents were natives did not bother me; so were their antagonists, and I have never believed that civil wars are somehow more virtuous and rational than wars of any other kind.

From my point of view, the operations of the Vietcong were, and still are, every bit as irrational as I now believe ours are. They don't seem to mind destroying their country any more than we do. I can understand why some Americans should be indifferent to the fate of Vietnam—to a certain degree, and to my own dismay, I am coming to feel that way myself—but I cannot understand why any Vietnamese should be indifferent to it. I wish Johnson would swallow his pride, whatever the consequences, but it seems to me it is positively idiotic for Ho Chi Minh not to take Johnson and Rusk at their word and, if what they are saying is all a bluff, call it. Why not set a place and a date, and see whether Rusk shows up? Everybody knows that unless American forces stay in Vietnam for the rest of history the Vietcong are going to have their triumphs anyway; if they negotiated us out of there tomorrow on any terms at all, the country would be theirs before long. (Tran Van Dinh, a former South Vietnamese diplomat, at odds with the Saigon regime, has speculated that this very knowledge may be a reason for Ho's not negotiating.)

Our departure would create a vacuum that would for a time be filled by the Vietcong but would ultimately be vulnerable to Chinese pressure. Tran Van Dinh believes that one of the last things Ho really wants is a complete American pullout.) If the Vietcong can remain as strong as they seem to be with all the Americans chasing them around the country, they should have no trouble at all seizing power after they sat down and told us enough lies about the future to make it impossible for us not to agree to get out.

The American people love to be lied to at peace conferences, and if that happened in this instance the guerrilla could put away his shooting irons, turn respectable, run for office, and run the country. General Ky could get a job with Pan American World Airways or just loll about on the Riviera, where he would be an authentic part of the scene and would find a lot of his old friends as well as many new ones.

Nothing so agreeable is going to happen. It is up to us to make the first move. Until recently, I felt that the best move would be a relatively small one—small but visible: not necessarily putting an end to the bomb-

ing but announcing a plan for scaling it down. I know Air Force officers who wouldn't object to this. Why, it may be asked, should they, since the targets are mostly gone anyway? But many other Air Force people would not object to something of the sort being done for political reasons even if they had strategic reservations. I did not think such a move would be of the least help in "bringing Hanoi to the conference table," but I thought that almost any deescalation would put an end to our scaring everyone else about our intentions, particularly toward the Chinese, and would help prepare us for the inevitable. In time, Johnson or some other President may begin a phased withdrawal in that way.

But I now fear that it will soon be too late—by which I mean too late to undo the damage to us. And it is we ourselves in this moment of history that we must think of before we think of anyone or anything else. This is a terrible thing to feel compelled to say. Edwin Reischauer, in his "Beyond Vietnam: The United States and Asia," argues that of the three options he thinks we have—escalation and a likely war with China, complete withdrawal as soon as possible, and plodding along on our present bloody and repugnant course—the last is the least disastrous and hence the most acceptable. Reischauer, who was until recently our Ambassador in Japan, is a fine scholar and humanist who has great respect and affection for the people of Asia, among whom he lived and studied for many years before John F. Kennedy persuaded him to leave scholarship for diplomacy.

He is no hawk, no imperialist, no warrior of any kind. He thinks we were crazy ever to get into this and crazy to have let it reach this point. But what he fears most of all is that if we abandon this undertaking now, we will tell ourselves that Asia is impossible, that we should never again have anything to do with it, and will abandon not only Vietnam but all of Asia, with the likely exception of Japan. I share his fear. We might treat Asia as we treated Europe after 1918.

We must ask ourselves right now whether that wouldn't be a pretty good idea. From some points of view, it might be an excellent idea. If our foreign policy in Asia produces such a monstrosity as the Vietnam war, why not get out? But, as Reischauer sees it, and as I would like to see it, our foreign policy in Asia is more than just the war in Vietnam. Most of Asia needs our help desperately, and we can perhaps use a good deal of Asian help in growing up. I want to go on having an American presence in Asia, because I don't want people to starve to death if we can prevent it, and I don't want Asians to despise my children and grandchildren and plot to destroy them.

Anyway, the thing wouldn't work. In recent years, a good many people have urged the dismantling of NATO, on the ground that it is no longer needed and that what is sometimes called "the European system" can work on its own. Whenever such proposals were brought to the attention of George Ball, the former Under-Secretary of State, and a dedicated Europeanist, he would ask their sponsors if they remembered what had happened to "The European system" in 1914 and in 1939. Things may have changed in Europe lately, but there has never been anything anyone could call "the Asian system," capable of settling what diplomats call "regional" problems—usually meaning wars.

Even if China managed to contain itself, which doesn't seem very likely, there would still be a good deal of unpleasantness between India and Pakistan. Making their own nuclear weapons might seem more important to them than it does now. And there would be unpleasantness elsewhere in Southeast Asia. And who knows whether some of Japan's long-range planners might not start casting a speculative eye on the "power vacuums" we would be creating?

Until very recently, these considerations put me in substantial agreement with Reischauer that perhaps Johnson's way offers fewer dangers than any of the others. But now I think we have reached—or are just about to reach—a point at which the argument no longer holds water. For one thing, if we continue much longer we may pull out of Asia whether we win, lose, or draw in Vietnam. It happens to be the view of our people that they don't want their kids to be killed so that Asians can go on eating. Most of them would see no logic in saying there is a necessary connection between starvation in India and Americans getting shot in Vietnam, but even if the logic were self-evident they would reject it.

Beyond all that, however, we seem as incapable as the South Vietnamese of running a war—or, at any rate, *this* war—and doing anything worthwhile at the same time. Congress insists on cutting our decent programs elsewhere in the world—to say nothing of those in this country—almost to the point of absurdity. In a literal sense, it is finding a way to make the wretched of the earth foot the bill for Vietnam. This isn't its intention, and as a nation we are still more generous than most, yet not only are innocent people dying in Vietnam but, because of the dollars-and-cents cost of the war, they are dying in Africa.

The war in Vietnam is heading too many of us for the loony bin. People who could once talk sensibly about politics are becoming unhinged and disoriented by it. Some are really thinking seriously of running Ronald Reagan for President. A young man who used to be a provocative analyst now screwily and oracularly proclaims that "morality, like politics, starts at the barrel of a gun." This is printed in a local high-brow journal, and it takes a professor from California to remind this well-educated ex-humanist, now evidently en route to some kind of New Left Fascism, that politics ends at the barrel of a gun. Not long ago, a highly intelligent and attractive young Negro spokesman for a radical organization said that he couldn't see any reason anyone should write a book about poverty—he was talking of Michael Harrington's "The Other America"—because anyone who was really poor and had lived in a ghetto knew all there was to know about it anyway. He said he himself could tell it like it is, but thought a book about it was a waste of anyone's time.

The land is filling up with cranks and zanies—some well intentioned, some vicious. It can be contended that Vietnam is not the only cause of goofing off, of alienation. Of course it isn't. But it provides the occasion, and it heightens the degree. And so it seems to me that if we stay on in Vietnam we will render ourselves incapable of being of much help to Asians or anyone else. We will need all the help we can get ourselves. If Ronald Reagan became President, I'd say by all means let's not have a foreign policy.

I want us to get out, and then try to recover our sanity, so that we may face the consequences. Some of them cause me almost no concern. The spread of Communism bothers me very little. It may be bad in some places and not so bad in others, but we can live with it just about anywhere—even ninety miles from Key West. Once, it was, or seemed to be, a world movement, and it was surely a brutally expansionist one. But its adventures in expansionism blunted its threat as a world movement. By 1948, when Tito broke with Stalin, it should have been clear that ideology was no match for nationalism—at least in Europe.

When China broke with Russia, it was obvious that the same thing went for Asia. Perhaps if we had borne in mind the history of earlier religious movements we could have seen all this fifty years ago. But we didn't see it, and neither, of course, did they. At any rate, we now know that the mere cir-

cumstance that a piece of real estate falls under Communist control doesn't constitute a threat to our existence, and doesn't even mean there is no more hope for the people involved. Nor, with things as they are, can my first concern be with the indisputable fact that by pulling out we would be breaking our pledge not only to the Vietnamese but to the Thais and others to whom what would follow might be quite painful. We are going to get out sooner or later anyway, and when we do we will not go back in, so, no matter what happens in the near future, they are going to have to work out their relations with China without much support from us. But some of the consequences of withdrawal disturb me greatly.

By and large, I think that most of American foreign policy for the last thirty years has been admirable. I want us to continue to be part of the world and to use our considerable talents for the benefit of all mankind. I suspect that if we get out of Vietnam we won't have much left in the way of a foreign policy. And, most of all, I fear what will happen right here if we withdraw. Theodore C. Sorensen writes that since Khrushchev could admit a mistake in the missile crisis five years ago, and Kennedy could acknowledge one at the Bay of Pigs a year before that, Lyndon Johnson ought to be able to do the same thing now. Here are two analogies that do not work at all. The missile crisis was over in a few days, the Bay of Pigs in a few hours.

No Russian soldiers died in the missile crisis, no American ones at the Bay of Pigs. It would take greater magnanimity and a greater dedication to the truth than we have any right to expect of any politician on earth for Lyndon Johnson to say that this whole bloody business is a mistake, and was from the start. He just cannot and will not do it. If he did, he would throw this country into worse turmoil than it has known at any time since the Civil War. Could he pull out and either say nothing or tell some lies? Could he possibly use Senator Aiken's ploy and announce that we had achieved our ends in Vietnam and were withdrawing?

Perhaps, but there would still be turmoil. There will be turmoil whether we stay or go, and I dread it. But, between the two, I have less fear of the consequences of withdrawal than of those of perseverance.

This war is intolerable. What does it mean to say that? Not much—talk is cheap. I haven't a clue as to how we can get out, and I have never much liked the idea of proposing without knowing of a means of disposing. I don't think we can write our way out, and I doubt very much if we can demonstrate our way out. But out is where I want us to be, and I don't know what a man can do except say what he thinks and feels.

RICHARD H. ROVERE.

GROWING INTERNATIONAL INTEREST IN THE METRIC SYSTEM

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, growing international interest in the adoption of the metric system of weights and measures is reflected in the summer 1968 edition of *American Scientist*.

This respected scientific journal has reprinted a pamphlet prepared by the Royal Society of London to encourage the use of metric symbols in scientific writing.

I am pleased to bring this concise and clear description of metric system sym-

bols to the attention of my colleagues. The article is a further indication of the growing popularity of the metric system. Also, it provides added reason for passage of H.R. 3136, which is the bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to make a study of the advantages and possible disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States.

The material follows:

METRICATION IN SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS

(By the Royal Society Conference of Editors)

(NOTE.—The Royal Society (London) has, in various fields, been taking a leading part in promoting the adoption of the metric (SI) system of units in the United Kingdom. The Council of the Royal Society, at a meeting in January 1968, decided that the Society's own journals should henceforth require the use of SI units as far as possible. A pamphlet has been prepared by the Conference of Editors and issued to the Fellows of the Society with a statement that the Royal Society will welcome its reproduction in whole or in part as desired.)

(For the information of American scientists we present here the pamphlet as received and inform our readers that copies may be obtained from the Executive Secretary, the Royal Society, 6 Carlton House Terrace, London, S.W. 1. Bulk orders, £2 per 100.—HUGH TAYLOR.)

The Royal Society Conference of Editors, after considering the role scientific journals can play in connexion with the Government's policy of promoting the general adoption of the metric system in the U.K., makes two main recommendations:

1. That the system of units known as SI should be adopted in all scientific and technical journals.

2. That, in order to keep to a minimum the difficulties that will inevitably arise during the period of transition, the change-over should be effected as quickly as possible.

SI (which is the abbreviation in many languages for *Système International d'Unités*) is an extension and refinement of the traditional metric system. It embodies features which make it logically superior to any other system as well as practically more convenient: it is rational, coherent, and comprehensive. The purpose of this leaflet is to provide a brief account of SI; it has been prepared in the hope that it will be useful to authors in a wide range of subjects and also that in many instances it will obviate the need for editors to produce their own notes.

The metric system which had spread to several countries in the aftermath of the French Revolution, began to be adopted in scientific work in the U.K. in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Its use extended more and more widely, although a few branches of science remain where Imperial Units have continued to predominate. It is fortunate that now that the time has come to discard completely the time-honoured native units (which are not without their advantages), there is to hand a fully developed International System to take their place. Over the years much thought has been given to extending and improving the metric system until finally, in 1960, the *Conférence Générale des Poids et Mesures*, the body responsible for maintaining standards of measurements (of which the U.K. is an active participant), formally approved SI. Already nearly thirty countries have decided to make it the only legally accepted system and it is clearly destined to become the universal currency of science and commerce. In many spheres in the U.K. (schools, universities, industry) the adoption of SI is being actively encouraged. The Conference of Editors is anxious that the journals devoted to science and engineering should seize the opportunity of playing a crucial role in helping to end

the confusion and wastefulness (both mental and material) resulting from the present multiplicity of units.

The main features of SI are as follows:

1. There are six basic units (see below) the metre and kilogramme taking the place of the centimetre and gramme of the old metric system.

2. The unit of force, the newton (kg m s^{-2}) is independent of the Earth's gravitation, and the often confusing introduction, in some branches of science and technology, of g into equations is no longer necessary.

3. The unit of energy in all forms is the joule (newton \times metre), and of power the joule per second (watt); thus the variously defined calories, together with the kilowatt hour, the B.t.u. and the horsepower are all superseded.

4. "Electrostatic" and "electromagnetic" units are replaced by SI electrical units.

5. Multiples of units are normally to be restricted to steps of a thousand and similarly fractions to steps of a thousandth.

Lists are appended of the basic SI units, of some derived SI units, of compatible units, and also examples of units which run counter to SI, the use of which is accordingly to be actively discouraged. Also listed are the names and symbols of the prefixes representing numerical factors: these are both convenient in obviating the need to write large numbers of zeros or in some instances high powers of 10, and also helpful in establishing familiarity with the numerical framework of modern science. It will be noted that the recommended prefixes are limited to $10^{\pm 31}$.

The rate of the change-over towards complete metrication will vary from journal to journal, depending on the subjects covered and the extent to which the metric system already holds sway. In certain branches of science and engineering editors may decide to proceed to their target along the following route (with equivalent values given in parentheses):

non-metric (SI) \rightarrow SI (non-metric) \rightarrow SI
(stage I) (stage II) (stage III)

In some branches full metrication will have to wait upon the installation of metric machinery and equipment. (Where measurements are expressed in the form of instrument readings they should be so recorded and a conversion factor quoted.)

In many journals, on the other hand, change-over to SI units can be achieved in one step, and the experience of some editors and authors where changes have already been introduced is that such changes are more readily accepted than would have been supposed before their introduction.

Whatever the particular circumstances, it is hoped that editors will play a positive part in encouraging their authors to adopt the International System of Units. When it becomes fully established in all disciplines the advantages will be enormous.

BASIC SI UNITS

Physical quantity	Name of unit	Symbol for unit ¹
Length.....	Metre.....	m
Mass.....	Kilogramme.....	kg
Time.....	Second.....	s
Electric current.....	Ampere.....	A
Thermodynamic temperature.....	Degree Kelvin.....	$^{\circ}\text{K}$
Luminous intensity.....	Candela.....	cd

¹ Symbols for units do not take a plural form.

SUPPLEMENTARY UNITS²

Physical quantity	Name of unit	Symbol for unit
Plane angle.....	Radian.....	rad
Solid angle.....	Steradian.....	sr

² These units are dimensionless.

DERIVED SI UNITS WITH SPECIAL NAMES

Physical quantity	Name of unit	Symbol for unit	Definition of unit
Energy	Joule	J	$\text{kg m}^2 \text{s}^{-2}$
Force	Newton	N	$\text{kg m s}^{-2} = \text{J m}^{-1}$
Power	Watt	W	$\text{kg m}^2 \text{s}^{-3} = \text{J s}^{-1}$
Electric charge	Coulomb	C	A s
Electric potential difference	Volt	V	$\text{kg m}^2 \text{s}^{-3} \text{A}^{-1} = \text{J A}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$
Electric resistance	Ohm	Ω	$\text{kg m}^2 \text{s}^{-3} \text{A}^{-2} = \text{V A}^{-1}$
Electric capacitance	Farad	F	$\text{A}^2 \text{s}^4 \text{kg}^{-1} \text{m}^{-2} = \text{A s V}^{-1}$
Magnetic flux	Weber	Wb	$\text{kg m}^2 \text{s}^{-3} \text{A}^{-1} = \text{V s}$
Inductance	Henry	H	$\text{kg m}^2 \text{s}^{-3} \text{A}^{-2} = \text{V s A}^{-1}$
Magnetic flux density	Tesla	T	$\text{kg s}^{-2} \text{A}^{-1} = \text{V s m}^{-2}$
Luminous flux	Lumen	lm	cd sr
Illumination	Lux	lx	cd sr m^{-2}
Frequency	Hertz	Hz	cycle per second
Customary temperature, t	Degree Celsius	$^{\circ}\text{C}$	$t/^{\circ}\text{C} = T/^{\circ}\text{K} - 273.15$

FRACTIONS AND MULTIPLES

Fraction	Prefix	Symbol	Multiple	Prefix	Symbol
10^{-1}	Deci	d	10	Deka	da
10^{-2}	Centi	c	10^2	Hecto	h
10^{-3}	Milli	m	10^3	Kilo	k
10^{-6}	Micro	μ	10^6	Mega	M
10^{-9}	Nano	n	10^9	Giga	G
10^{-12}	Pico	p	10^{12}	Terra	T
10^{-15}	Femto	f			
10^{-18}	Atto	a			

*To be restricted to instances where there is a strongly felt need, such as may be experienced in the early days of metrication in favour of the centimetre as the unit of length in certain biological measurements.

Compound prefixes should not be used, e.g., 10^{-6} metre is represented by—

1 nm, not 1 m μ m

The attaching of a prefix to a unit in effect constitutes a new unit, e.g.—

1 km 2 = 1 (km) 2 = 10^6 m^2
not 1 k(m 2) = 10^3 m^2

Where possible any numerical prefix should appear in the numerator of an expression.

EXAMPLES OF OTHER DERIVED SI UNITS

Physical quantity	SI unit	Symbol for unit
Area	Square metre	m^2
Volume	Cubic metre	m^3
Density	Kilogramme per cubic metre	kg m^{-3}
Velocity	Metre per second	m s^{-1}
Angular velocity	Radian per second	rad s^{-1}
Acceleration	Metre per second squared	m s^{-2}
Pressure	Newton per square metre	N m^{-2}
Kinematic viscosity, diffusion coefficient	Square metre per second	$\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$
Dynamic viscosity	Newton second per square metre	N s m^{-2}
Electric field strength	Volt per metre	V m^{-1}
Magnetic field strength	Ampere per metre	A m^{-1}
Luminance	Candela per square metre	cd m^{-2}

UNITS TO BE ALLOWED IN CONJUNCTION WITH SI

Physical quantity	Name of unit	Symbol for unit	Definition of unit
Length	Parsec	pc	$30.87 \times 10^{15} \text{ m}$
Area	Barn	b	10^{-28} m^2
	Hectare	ha	10^4 m^2
Volume	Litre	l	$10^{-3} \text{ m}^3 = \text{dm}^3$
Pressure	Bar	bar	10^5 N m^{-2}
Mass	Tonne	t	$10^3 \text{ kg} = \text{Mg}$
Kinematic viscosity, diffusion coefficient	Stokes	St	$10^{-4} \text{ m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$
Dynamic viscosity	Poise	P	$10^{-1} \text{ kg m}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$
Magnetic flux density (magnetic induction)	Gauss	G	10^{-4} T
Radioactivity	Curie	Ci	$37 \times 10^9 \text{ s}^{-1}$
Energy	Electron-volt	eV	$1.6021 \times 10^{-19} \text{ J}$

The common units of time (e.g., hour, year) will persist, and also, in appropriate contexts, the angular degree.

Until such time as a new name may be adopted for the kilogramme as the basic unit of mass, the gramme will often be used, both as an elementary unit (to avoid the absurdity of mkg) and in association with numerical prefixes, e.g., μg .

EXAMPLES OF UNITS CONTRARY TO SI, WITH THEIR EQUIVALENTS*

Physical quantity	Unit	Equivalent
Length	ångström	10^{-10} m
	Inch	0.0254 m
	Foot	0.3048 m
	Yard	0.9144 m
	Mile	1.609 34 km
	Nautical mile	1.853 8 km
Area	Square inch	645.16 mm 2
	Square foot	0.092 903 m 2
	Square yard	0.836 127 m 2
	Square mile	2.589 99 km 2
Volume	Cubic inch	$1.638 71 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^3$
	Cubic foot	0.028 316 m 3
	U.K. gallon	0.004 546 092 m 3
Mass	Pound	0.453 592 37 kg
	Slug	14.593 9 kg
Density	Pound/cubic inch	$2.767 99 \times 10^4 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$
	Pound/cubic foot	$16.0185 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$
Force	Dyne	10^{-5} N
	Poundal	0.138 255 N
	Pound-force	4.448 22 N
	Kilogramme-force	9.806 65 N
Pressure	Atmosphere	$101.325 \text{ kN m}^{-2}$
	Torr	133.322 N m^{-2}
	Pound (f)/sq. in.	6894.76 N m^{-2}
Energy	Erg	10^{-7} J
	Calorie (I.T.)	4.1868 J
	Calorie (15 $^{\circ}\text{C}$)	4.1855 J
	Calorie (thermo-chemical)	4.184 J
	B.t.u.	1055.06 J
	Foot poundal	0.042 140 J
	Foot pound (f)	1.355 82 J
Power	Horse power	745.700 W
Temperature	Degree Rankine	$\frac{5}{9} ^{\circ}\text{K}$
	Degree Fahrenheit	$t/^{\circ}\text{F} = \frac{9}{5} T/^{\circ}\text{C} + 32$

*Fuller lists are to be found in the National Physical Laboratory's "Changing to the Metric System" (Anderson & Brigg). London: H.M.S.O. (1966).

COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AT NOTRE DAME COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 3, I was hon-

ored to participate in the 34th annual commencement exercises at Notre Dame College of Staten Island. Notre Dame is one of the finest colleges on the eastern seaboard, and the young ladies who graduated this year can be proud of their accomplishments at this fine school. The commencement address was delivered by the Honorable Malcolm Wilson, Lieutenant Governor of the State of New York. I feel his remarks are particularly enlightening, and I include the text of his speech for the benefit of my colleagues. Also, I include the list of graduates from the Notre Dame College class of 1968:

REMARKS OF LT. GOV. MALCOLM WILSON AT ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT OF NOTRE DAME COLLEGE OF STATEN ISLAND, JUNE 3, 1968

First of all I want to express my heartfelt gratitude to Sister Rita Donahue, your president, for the privilege she has awarded me of sharing with you the joy and significance of this occasion.

As you young women of the class of '68 receive your diplomas—your accolade for having completed four years of training in this fine Catholic institution of learning—you have earned the congratulations of all of us here, and we offer them to you in unstinted measure. No one receives a college diploma unless that one has cooperated in full with those who made it possible. But I am sure that each one of you has in mind that in being awarded your diploma you are the recipient of a privilege and that every privilege which we are accorded in life connotes a corresponding obligation.

I do not refer now to an obligation to the parents and others whose cooperation made possible your attendance here. If obligation there be in that regard, it is recorded in your hearts—and from there it will be repaid. I speak rather of your obligation to God who gave you the minds to assimilate and to benefit from the education which you have received.

Your parents after all—especially your fathers—have provided for you the finest in education because it was their joy to do so. No man, I suppose—and I speak from experience—does anything in life that is easier than to give to a daughter. The only time we fathers are in difficulty is when it comes to saying "No", (as I suppose all of you young ladies are well aware!). I imagine that from the moment when Eve presented Adam with their first daughter, God knew what to expect from him and has been tolerant with us ever since. For we temporal fathers indulge ourselves in the folly of love, but when God who is infinitely wiser gives generously, as He has to you, He expects in His justice a fair accounting.

The period of history in which you graduate is challenging and exciting; if we lose our objectivity in assessing it, it could well be terrifying. The last quarter of a century has seen greater advances in the scientific field than were dreamt of in the preceding thousand years. The tempo of our times has accelerated to such a degree that it is literally impossible to keep pace with it. The tremors of revolution are stirring this globe of ours—revolution social, political and religious. People, particularly young people the world over are tossing aside the pat answers that have satisfied the generations before them and are seeking new answers to age-old questions. They question even the normal traditions that have safe-guarded personal values. They want to revise and re-think the whole universe.

How are you to cope with the problems that confront you? You are modern young women and a part of your time. I suggest the ultimate answer is to be found in the one basic truth that is by now a part of the very core of your being. It is part of the eternal plan and you know that it will remain forever unchanged. No matter through what

spaces man may soar—no matter what far planets he may eventually reach—he was created for a threefold purpose: to know God, to love Him and to serve Him. It is as simple as that. It is a *fact*—as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be.

But do not think that anyone minimizes the pressures that will be exerted upon you to question even that truth. God is not dead—nor is the devil, for you remember that he is reputed to have won the robe of Christ when lots were cast for it; and being ever a consummate actor, he can don any disguise and fool even the most wary of us at times. And make no mistake: in the world today he has surrounded himself with many willing—and I suppose, at times, even unwilling apprentices.

A basic indication of the well-educated human being, one who has truly attained maturity, is the extent to which he or she is self-disciplined. The day is past when any of you here would need or expect the props of discipline which were offered to you by wise parents or by the fine faculty that has surrounded you up to now. You are mature young women who are capable of making your own decisions in answer to the multiple problems that you will face. But it will require a full measure of strength and self-discipline to maintain your own standards and ideals in a world that is bent on destroying them.

Some of you who have received your degrees today have already chosen the field where you feel you can best serve God. Sisters, I congratulate you! I can think of no time in the history of the church when the call to a woman to dedicate herself wholly to Him has presented such a magnificent challenge. More and more in the next few years will you young sisters be called upon to carry your apostolate to the whole secular community in which you live, rather than confining yourselves to the small area enclosed by the walls of the religious communities of which you are a part. What a fertile field you will find from which to garner souls for God!

To you other young women may I point out that your choice in life is as varied as your individual talents. You are surrounded on all sides by doors, anyone of which you may choose as the portal through which you will step into the adult world. There are the doors of marriage, the law, science, politics, journalism, medicine, the arts—almost limitless are the opportunities presented to a woman graduated from a fine college today. But I wish you would have one thing firmly in mind. No matter what field you choose to make your life's work, never in any of them will you be entering a man's world—because there is no such thing.

This is a world of men and women, and no matter how emancipated you have become, whatever goals you set for yourselves, whatever obligations you voluntarily assume, you, all of you, religious and lay alike, bear first and foremost the responsibility placed upon you by God: That of being a woman. For woman, it is said, was created to be the balance wheel for man; each by nature complements the other, and this is true no matter what field they share. Man is aggressive and woman accomplishes her end with greater gentleness; man declares war and to woman falls the role of arbiter and peace-maker; man is by nature in great measure an egotist, but a woman understands in some intuitive way that she grows no smaller in stature by building up those around her and helping them to develop their full potential.

We men do not ask that you young women be warriors. That role we have traditionally reserved for ourselves, perhaps because it is a plan of nature, or perhaps because it is the easier one. To woman falls the harder and infinitely more important role of guardian and disseminator of spiritual strength. By the plan of creation it is in the heart of

woman that God has implanted the seeds of strength and comfort that are to flower and support his universe. When to that plan of the creator, as old as time, we add the complete development of fine minds and characters through modern Catholic education, we arrive at you, the graduating class of today, each of you bearing on her shoulders heavily it is true, but not too heavily, a responsibility from which there must be no turning away.

I would like to leave one more thought with you on this occasion which marks the termination of one complete phase of your lives. Consider seriously the fact that woman is by nature the home-maker. I am not now paraphrasing the old adage "Woman's Place Is in the Home" nor am I disparaging that sentiment, except insofar as I do not feel that any of us today has the right to light the fire on his or her own hearth, draw the blinds, gather loved ones around and say "Here We Are Sheltered and Safe"—not while in the dark beyond those blinds and beyond the reach of the hearth-fire's warmth, so many millions of homeless, cold and frightened people are crying out for help.

Home, you know, has a second definition even in the dictionary. It is a "place to rest in and be safe". There is your role as home-makers—home-makers for the world, not only for those near and dear to you. Let it be your responsibility to make the world a "place to rest in and be safe". Let it be yours to do by holding fast to and spreading your own spiritual strength and moral courage to those around you—whether your own husbands and children—other's children that you may teach—or those who surround you in whatever profession or field you may choose for your life's work.

If the educated Catholic woman will make that her chief goal in life, then surely some day—probably we who are so proud of you today will not live to see it; possibly not even you will—but some day the jubilant cry must go up from a mankind freed at last from the crippling vise of materialistic force and moral weakness "Lord, I do fear Thou hast made the world too beautiful this year!"

CLASS OF 1968

Kathleen Marie Hansen, Valedictorian, Bachelor of Science in Education (cum laude)—Honor Key.

Barbara Chorman, Salutatorian, Bachelor of Arts (cum laude)—Honor Key.

Patricia Plankey, Bachelor of Arts (cum laude)—Honor Key.

Colleen Elizabeth Crosson, Bachelor of Science in Education (cum laude)—Honor Key.

Kathleen Mary Krank, Bachelor of Arts (cum laude)—Honor Key.

Mary Donlon, Bachelor of Arts (cum laude)—Honor Key.

Noreen MacEvoy, C.N.D., Bachelor of Arts (cum laude)—Honor Key.

Suzette Ann Sherry, Bachelor of Arts (cum laude)—Honor Key.

Janet Kathryn Schrieber, Bachelor of Arts (cum laude)—Honor Key.

Claudia Hart, Bachelor of Science in Education, Student President.

Jennifer Maureen Abbott, Bachelor of Arts.

Marianne Adamenas, Bachelor of Arts.

Susan Aery, C.N.D., Bachelor of Arts.

Patricia Ann Ahern, Bachelor of Arts.

Grace L. Altomari, Bachelor of Arts.

Madeline Elizabeth Ambry, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Janet Linda Augustine, Bachelor of Arts.

Beatrice Baker, C.N.D., Bachelor of Science in Education.

Kathleen Margaret Barry, Bachelor of Arts.

Diana Florence Baumlín, Bachelor of Arts.

Stanis Marusak Beck, Bachelor of Arts.

Dolores Karen Belby, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Loretta Bober, Bachelor of Arts.

Rose Michelle Boccasio, Bachelor of Arts.

Jo-Ann Bongiovanni, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Carol Lillian Caccese, Bachelor of Arts.

Ellenanne B. Caldwell, Bachelor of Arts.

Linda A. Campbell, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Patricia K. Campbell, Bachelor of Arts.

Rena Ann Campomenosi, Bachelor of Arts.

Sandra E. Cangiano, Bachelor of Arts.

Elaine T. Capelli, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Kathleen Maura Carmody, Bachelor of Arts.

Yolanda Ann Clemente, Bachelor of Arts.

Mary Elizabeth Clooney, Bachelor of Arts.

Mary Margaret Coggin, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Janis C. Craviso, Bachelor of Arts.

Noreen Theresa Crowe, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Ann Marie Cunningham, Bachelor of Arts.

Linda Ann Dadswell, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Joyce Ann D'Amico, Bachelor of Arts.

Margaret Patricia Dawley, Bachelor of Arts.

Elleen Dokus, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Barbara Lynn Donovan, C.N.D., Bachelor of Science in Education.

Maureen C. Donovan, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Margaret Catherine Driscoll, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Margaret Mary Duffy, Bachelor of Arts.

Carol Essig, Bachelor of Arts.

Barbara Jean Fink, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Annamarie Flanagan, Bachelor of Arts.

Patricia Anne Franzonello, Bachelor of Arts.

Mary Elizabeth Gallagher, Bachelor of Arts.

Linda Rose Gallo, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Barbara Gehshan, Bachelor of Arts.

Pauline Grassi, Bachelor of Arts.

Doreen Lynne Gregory, Bachelor of Arts.

Susan M. Haggerty, Bachelor of Arts.

Maryann Hedaa, C.N.D., Bachelor of Arts.

Margaret Mary Hennelly, Bachelor of Arts.

Helen V. Hickey, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Rosemary Teresa Javaruski, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Karen Elleen Johansen, Bachelor of Arts.

Clare Mary Johnson, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Carol Anne Kalowsky, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Kathleen Agnes Kelleher, Bachelor of Arts.

Sharon Ann Kelly, Bachelor of Arts.

Virginia Rose Kempf, Bachelor of Arts.

Mary Alice Kenney, Bachelor of Arts.

Elizabeth Mary Kocot, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Mary Geraldine Kohoot, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Tatiana Kramarev, Bachelor of Arts.

Donna Lynn Lanco, Bachelor of Arts.

Monica Landry, C.N.D., Bachelor of Arts.

Lorraine Larriee, C.N.D., Bachelor of Science in Education.

Barbara Marie Lawaska, Bachelor of Arts.

Carol Ann Lawlor, Bachelor of Science in Education—Honor Key.

Elleen Cecilia Ledzion, Bachelor of Arts.

Mary Ann Lemieux, C.N.D., Bachelor of Science in Education.

Monica Leonard, C.N.D., Bachelor of Science in Education.

Karen Marie Leonhardt, Bachelor of Arts.

Sally Longo, C.N.D., Bachelor of Science in Education.

Elleen Maguire, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Frances Maguire, Bachelor of Arts.

Darleen Mayo, C.N.D., Bachelor of Science in Education.

Mary Elizabeth McAuliffe, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Jeanne A. McCarthy, Bachelor of Science in Education.

Patricia Anne McElligott, Bachelor of Arts.

Eleanor D. McGuire, Bachelor of Arts.
 Ruth Ann Meehan, Bachelor of Arts.
 Leonora Marie Megna, Bachelor of Arts.
 Mary Elizabeth Monahan, Bachelor of Arts.
 Carol Patricia Moran, Bachelor of Arts.
 Mary Ellen Mullin, Bachelor of Arts—Honor Key.
 Ellen Murphy, C.N.D., Bachelor of Arts.
 Mary Ellen Murphy, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Maureen Ann Murphy, Bachelor of Arts.
 Susan Murphy, Bachelor of Arts.
 Dorothy Marie Nelson, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Patricia Joan Norman, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Mario Nowicki, Bachelor of Arts—Honor Key.
 Rosemarie O'Rourke, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Patricia M. Pattison, Bachelor of Arts.
 Kathleen Elizabeth Pearson, Bachelor of Arts.
 Carol A. Pender, Bachelor of Arts.
 Maria Antoinetta Penna, Bachelor of Arts.
 Mary Dianne Peters, Bachelor of Arts.
 Sally Plunket, Bachelor of Arts.
 Judith Anne Poje, Bachelor of Arts.
 Consuelo Irene Polanco, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Ann Powell, Bachelor of Arts.
 Augusta Victoria Pumilla, Bachelor of Arts.
 Patricia Ellen Quinlan, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Kathleen Patricia Reilly, Bachelor of Arts.
 Patricia L. Reilly, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Marlon Adele Rozger, Bachelor of Arts.
 Elena Marie Sarnelle, Bachelor of Arts.
 Ursula Elizabeth Schwarz, Bachelor of Arts.
 Carolyn Ruth Sienicki, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Pauline Clara Simmen, Bachelor of Arts.
 Mary Jane Singler, Bachelor of Arts.
 Barbara A. B. Smith, Bachelor of Arts.
 Dorothy Marie Smith, Bachelor of Arts.
 Joan Marie Smith, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Roberta Sollazzo, Bachelor of Arts.
 Ann Marie Strleckis, C.N.D., Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Elizabeth Sullivan, C.N.D., Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Norma Sullivan, Bachelor of Arts.
 Mary Ellen Kathleen Tobin, Bachelor of Arts.
 Susan Patricia Traks, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Patricia Ann Tuite, Bachelor of Arts.
 Marie Anne Uffelmann, C.N.D., Bachelor of Arts.
 Mariann Tiboni Verhey, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Grace A. Walsh, Bachelor of Arts.
 Carol Ann Wittmann, Bachelor of Science in Education.
 Anna Zanca, Bachelor of Science in Education.

THE FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM—CURRENT ACTIVITIES AND FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the Members to a recent address by the very able Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy, Stanley S. Surrey, before the Boston Economic Club.

His address, entitled "The Federal Tax System—Current Activities and Future Possibilities," not only describes current

tax legislative matters being examined by the Congress, but touches upon a great number of items being talked about and studied by the business and academic communities, as well as within the Federal Government.

In particular I would like to draw attention to those portions of his remarks dealing with the role the tax system plays in the social fabric of today's society. Mr. Surrey discusses many of the subjects we have debated here and have been reading about in many journals for some time. It is a thought-provoking talk about the very real world of taxes, written in clear, lucid language.

The speech deserves the prompt attention of all Members of Congress.

The speech follows:

THE FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM—CURRENT ACTIVITIES AND FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

(Remarks by the Honorable Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, before the Boston Economic Club, Boston, Mass., May 15, 1968)

Major changes in the Federal tax system have now become an annual experience. That system is so directly involved in our domestic and international activities that the constant changes in those activities and concerns are reflected in alternations of our tax structure. Sometimes the tax changes that take place in a given year are the result of events that develop during that year and require a prompt tax response. Sometimes—perhaps more often—the changes are the culmination of considerations and forces that began to gather several, perhaps many, years in the past. As a consequence, a survey of the Federal tax scene requires not only a description of current legislative activities but also an examination of current discussions and studies that may lead to legislative involvement in the future.

CURRENT LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

The major activity in Federal tax legislation in 1968 is the emerging tax increase bill. One should really refer to the time span of that bill as 1967–1968 because the surcharge proposal has been before the Congress since last August. The tax increase proposal has had a tortuous journey and the Secretary of the Treasury throughout has had to play many roles. At times he has been a tax candidate, seeing progress in this procedural move or that statement by a legislator when all else saw only set back. At times he has sorrowfully been a tax Cassandra, as crises recurred in the international markets and gold filled the headlines. And at many another time he has been the ambulance surgeon on the emergency call or even a Dr. Christiaan Barnard—always able to detect a pulse or heartbeat when all others had put away their stethoscopes.

There are certainly many interesting facets of that journey. For one, the forecasting that underlay the recommendation for a tax increase was on target throughout. The economic pace of the economy was clearly foretold—a pause in the first part of 1967, a rise in the second half that would, in the absence of a tax increase, amount to an accelerated rate of growth that would be too rapid for our economic health. The domestic and international consequences that would accompany the unacceptable deficit position obtaining without a tax increase were also accurately foretold—rises in interest rates, an inflationary trend in prices, a setback to our trade surplus because of increased imports, a severely weakened balance of payments position, and attacks on the dollar in the international monetary field. The actual proving out of such a forecast is itself somewhat of a rare event where the forecast is the basis for policy action designed to af-

fect the events forecast—to prevent too steep a rise or to brake a fall—and thus prevent prediction from becoming history. And so when a forecast calling for policy change has become actuality, then policy moves have gone astray—in this case through the passage of time. The enactment of the tax increase will start us on the journey away from all these dangerous instabilities to a more secure position at home and abroad.

Nor was the need for a tax increase a special phenomenon of the new economies or a matter of so-called fine tuning. Indeed, it was in response to a traditional reason for a tax increase—the need for revenues to meet rising expenditures of Government caused by our involvement in hostilities. The United States, ever since the ill-advised tax increase in the Depression, has not required an increase in income taxes except in a time of hostilities, for it is only in such a period that Government expenditures have outrun revenues. Thus, in one sense the surcharge proposal was a classic textbook case for a tax increase.

But the textbooks would have missed some other facets of the fiscal scene. One of these has been the desire of the Congress and the Committees charged with revenue policy—especially the Ways and Means Committee—and on whom falls the task of increasing taxes, to achieve a coordination between Congressional consideration of appropriations and expenditures and Congressional consideration of tax policy. The annual, and often biannual and even triannual bouts with the limit on the public debt had not proven to be an effective instrument of coordination, though they did pave the way to a much improved substantive format for the Federal Budget and refinements in the concept of Budget surplus or deficit. The need for a tax increase was soon seen as apparently offering a much stronger instrument, and this attitude gradually grew in intensity and scope. As a result, the tax increase proposal became the device to achieve last year a reduction in fiscal year 1968 "controllable" expenditures (over \$4 billion), and now under the Conference Report a reduction in fiscal year 1969 expenditures (\$6 billion), a cut back in proposed new obligatory authority for fiscal year 1969 (\$10 billion), and a reexamination of carryover obligatory authority (\$8 billion). The gradual development of these expenditure changes was accompanied by an increasing degree of interchange between the Tax Committees and the Appropriations Committees, especially on the House side. This procedural change, growing as it did out of a whole variety of tentative actions and shifting goals as the new terrain was explored, proved a time-consuming process. And we are still left with the speculations as to what these developments may portend.

We can be hopeful, I believe, that the time involved in enacting the tax surcharge proposal will not be characteristic of the response to future needed changes in the level of taxes. There are too many particular connotations respecting this proposal—the varying attitudes to Vietnam hostilities for one—to make that time span a precedent. And hence, for example, any need to reduce taxes promptly in a Post-Vietnam period to maintain full employment should not have to face a similar time span.

Another interesting facet is that the format of the tax increase was really never a subject of controversy. As a result of careful study of this matter in 1966, culminating in the Hearings of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Joint Economic Committee—a study and Hearing which the Administration had urged in preparation for the possible tax increase—the country had available a considerable amount of analysis and data on the shape of a tax increase, including the recommendation of that Subcommittee for the surcharge form. The tax proposal reflected this background, and involved three essential

aspects: an income tax surcharge form for both individuals and corporations; a shielding of those in the lowest brackets from the increase; and a temporary design for the increase. To a degree that is unusual in tax legislation, the initial proposal is reflected in the final version essentially without change.

The economic effect of the tax increase will be heightened by two recent developments in our tax structure—graduated withholding on wage and salary earners, and developments leading to a complete system of current tax payments for corporations. The former came in 1966, and the latter was built up by legislation in 1964 and 1966 and now by the corporate acceleration provisions in the current bill. The temporary tax increase will thus be immediately reflected in tax payments based on current levels of income and profits, so that those incomes and profits will at once bear the restraining effect of the increase.

While our balance of payments problems are reflected in the tax increase bill, they are also the occasion for other 1968 legislative activity still unfolding. For one, the foreign travel bill is now in the Senate, with the 5 percent travel tax extended to overseas air transportation and a tightening of customs measures. There is still the need further to dampen tourist expenditures abroad. While foreign travel has its undoubted advantages for both individual families and the nation, still a family must budget for its outlays and so must the nation budget its international expenditures to the foreign exchange available. In the trade field, attention now shifts to the Hearings before the Ways and Means Committee scheduled for June 4.

FUTURE EVENTS

Let us turn to the matter of future events in the tax field—or more properly current discussions, studies, developments, or what you will—that are likely to bring about legislative involvement at some point. I use the word involvement advisedly and broadly—it ranges from active Congressional consideration producing legislative enactment to a Congressional decision not to take any action despite the call for consideration from this or that quarter. For I must emphasize that I am here describing and not predicting—and the area of description extends beyond government attitudes to business and labor discussion, academic interests, current research, and so on.

Tax reform

There is a recognized need for a major effort for further tax reform. The pending tax bill calls for the President to submit proposals for a comprehensive reform this year. The consideration of tax reform has been held off by the deliberations over the tax bill. The operational aspects of tax legislation permit only one train to be on the main track at a given time, and so tax reform has been waiting in the railway yards for the main track to clear.

There is much to do in tax revision and many ideas have already been expressed, some in speeches by Treasury officials, some in speeches by legislators. The Treasury, for example, has called attention to the need to revise the rules relating to the transfer of property by death or gift, so as to achieve a more equitable estate and gift tax system with less tax distortion in family dispositions of property and a rational income tax treatment of appreciated assets so transferred. It has among other matters also stressed the need to eliminate corporate multiple surtax exemptions; to achieve a rational rearrangement of the tax treatment of the elderly; and to eliminate abuses in the area of private foundations and tax-exempt organizations generally. (It is an interesting commentary—should I say insight—on the foundation scene that *Fortune* magazine in its recent article on "America's Centimillionaires" includes in its estimates of an individual's wealth the holdings of "foundations

established by the individuals or their spouses.")

Chairman Long of the Finance Committee, in a recent speech, also mentioned a proposal he had earlier suggested, and which has, in one form or another, been introduced in bills by other legislators, that of a "minimum tax" to be applied to an expanded income base including various forms of income now excluded from coverage of the regular tax. He has also suggested maximum effective tax rates applied to the same expanded base. Chairman Mills has spoken of the need for steps designed to reduce the complexity of various facets of the measure of taxable net income. Others have focused on aspects of the tax law that enable people of large wealth to pay little income tax, and even in some cases to escape payment entirely. The Treasury has spoken of tax reform as involving a combination of revenue-raising and revenue-losing measures, so that on net balance there would be no significant overall budgetary effect. A number of Congressmen have viewed reform only from the revenue-raising, "closing of loopholes" aspect.

Some matters that were on various lists are already on the legislative scene, for tax reform must be a constant process and all developments cannot wait on major efforts for revision. Thus, the pending bill contains a provision setting a ceiling on tax-exempt industrial development bonds, thereby preventing them from swamping the regular tax-exempt bond market and from making private corporate bonds an archaic instrument.

The Secretary of Labor has submitted to the Congress proposals for revision of the structure of private pension plans involving a minimum standard of vesting, standards for the funding of benefits, and a system of plan termination protection. The measure is aptly entitled the "Pension Benefits Security Act of 1968"—for it deals with assuring a worker that years of labor in a company having a pension plan will bring him a vested benefit on retirement even though events cause him to leave that company before retirement age, and that there will be funds on hand for the payment of that benefit. This program is based on recommendations by an interagency staff committee, including Treasury Department participation, which were made after extensive consultations with informed groups regarding prior proposals. The Treasury fully supports this program. It also believes that its formulation as a measure outside the tax laws is a recognition of the importance of these matters in the whole context of employer-employee relations, a point of view that had been stressed by employer groups in criticizing prior proposals as not properly a part of the tax system.

As a substantive matter, I cannot see how one can quarrel with the basic goals of the Labor Department proposal. There is persuasive and saddening testimony to the hardship that can result from a lack of vesting in the many letters we and other Government agencies receive from individuals who, after working years for an employer, suddenly find they have lost their pension accruals because of a change in job or even a lay off. Aside even from the inequity of this result, the simple fact is that these individuals must now face retirement without the pension they expected. There is no way for them to retrace their steps and make other financial arrangements. For them, the private pension system is a failure and a mockery. And the expectation of the pension may well have affected their spending decisions while employed under the plan. In a country in which only half of the employees (aged 30 to 50) who have been with an employer for 10 years will be with that same employer in the next 10 years, this high degree of labor mobility requires that the vesting of benefits be an integral part of the private pension system. The Labor Department proposals will

thus enable the private pension plan system to achieve the vital and beneficial role for which it was designed.

Poverty and taxes

The tax system is a part of the social fabric of our nation. As such it will be affected by changes in that fabric and must be responsive to those changes, consistent with performance of its function of supplying government revenues fairly and effectively. Significant events, violent and non-violent, are daily focusing the nation's attention on great poverty within our affluent society. The effects of this poverty and its growing subculture should—one hopes—appeal to our consciences and our capacity to move forward intelligently rather than to our fears. How will the tax system be involved in this appeal?

The tax system must play an essential role in enabling fiscal policy to fulfill the tasks of providing a full employment economy with as few destabilizing turns up or down as possible. Such an economy by itself will not eliminate poverty or solve our urban crisis, but without it all solutions to those ills will fail. The problems are so immense that only with the full use of our potential resources will we be in a position to achieve success in overcoming them. Consequently, we must build on our limited experience of managing a full employment economy, improve our forecasting techniques, but more importantly, achieve the flexible procedures and postures that permit a sufficiently prompt response to the measures that the forecasts require.

Against a background of full employment, what is the relevance of our attack on poverty to the tax system? There is first the direct matter of the payment of a tax itself. Our present Federal income tax does reach below the poverty level, especially for single persons and married couples with no dependents. The President has said that as fiscal conditions permit this should be corrected, and the burden of income tax payments lifted from those in poverty. In keeping with this view, as I stated earlier, the 10 percent surcharge does not apply to the lowest income brackets.

Assuming that step to be an accepted policy goal, the scholars have turned to other taxes paid by the poor and in this regard are critically examining the Social Security payroll taxes. They point out that the employee tax is applied to the first dollar of wages without regard for family size and is proportional to wages covered, all in contrast to the income tax. As a consequence the present employee payroll tax is higher than the income tax for about 25 percent of the people paying Social Security tax. Moreover, this is wholly apart from the question of the incidence of the employer tax, which most economists believe also to fall on wages. Of course the benefits of the Social Security system are paid in a progressive manner. But the scholars are questioning whether the present poor should be called on to pay taxes to provide benefits for the currently retired, or for their own benefits in the future. Any significant increase in Social Security benefits is thus likely to involve the Congress in a consideration of the impact of Social Security taxes below the poverty level.

Somewhat similar concerns could well play a part in any Congressional consideration of suggested changes looking to greater use of indirect taxation in the Federal tax structure. Legislation in recent years has involved an extensive cutback of Federal excise taxes, leaving this type of taxation largely to States and cities and strengthening the role of the income tax in the Federal structure. This concentration on the income tax at the Federal level has brought its fiscal policy benefits, for the United States has shaped that tax into a measure that can be promptly responsive to our fiscal needs, unlike the income tax structures in most

countries. And we are steadily improving the equity of the tax. In some business—and academic—circles, consideration is being given to adding a mass sales tax at the Federal level, be it a retail sales tax similar to our State taxes or a value-added tax which would have the same economic effect. The thought generally is to substitute this for a part of the corporate tax. Others have asserted this would shift the burden of the tax dollars involved from corporations and their shareholders to the consumer, and thus to the poor to the extent of their share in consumption. In their view a sales tax is clearly more regressive than an income tax, and while measures perhaps can be considered to lessen the regressivity of the sales tax, those measures would complicate its administration. They would thus contend such a move to a sales tax at the Federal level would be inconsistent with efforts to relieve the poor of their income tax burdens. Congress may perhaps find itself at some later date involved in this debate which, again, is still pretty much confined to research circles and some business groups.

Poverty and tax expenditures

Another facet of the attacks on poverty and the urban crisis is the realization that all levels of Government will be required to spend increasingly larger sums on social programs. This being so, the broad questions to be answered are the nature of these expenditures and the amounts to be spent. The relationship of the latter question to the tax system is clear, but even the first question has a direct bearing on the tax structure. For many of the suggested expenditures have a tax connotation.

There has been considerable academic interest and increasing business interest in our whole public assistance or welfare system. As an illustration, the recent "Report from the Steering Committee of the Arden House Conference on Public Welfare" states that:

"The present system of public assistance does not work well. It covers only 8-million of the 30-million Americans living in poverty. It is demeaning, inefficient, inadequate, and has so many disincentives built into it that it encourages continued dependency.

"It should be replaced with an income maintenance system, possibly a negative income tax, which would bring all 30-million Americans up to at least the official Federal poverty line. Such a system should contain strong incentives to work, try to contain regional cost of living differentials, and be administered by the Internal Revenue Service to provide greater administrative efficiency and effectiveness than now exists."

Other groups or individuals have also called for an income maintenance system, as a complement to or perhaps as an evolution of an improved welfare system. The President's Committee on Income Maintenance is now considering this whole subject.

Essentially an income maintenance system is an expenditure program, even when it has the name and design of a negative income tax. For a negative income tax calls for payments to people below a designated level of need. The payments by the Government decrease as the individuals' incomes come closer to that level. Once they reach that level and the individuals become taxpayers, they have passed from the negative tax stage (payments of money to them) to the positive or traditional income tax stage (payments of tax by them). The degree of association to the traditional income tax depends on the relationship of the level of need, below which payments are made by Government, to the levels (determined by personal exemptions and the minimum standard deduction) governing positive income tax payments; the extent to which the "negative income" (the amount by which actual income falls below the level of need) is measured by concepts and definitions of

income now used in the income tax; and the extent of participation by the Internal Revenue Service in the administration of the payments to the individuals.

Intense exploration of the income maintenance line of approach—how would it be administered and effectuated, what is the effect on incentives to work, what is the relationship to welfare programs—will clearly be helpful to the Congress when it comes to consider such proposals. The need for intense exploration is increased by the fact that there are competitors for the large expenditure dollars involved in that line of approach. One competitor, for example, has the general name of "tax sharing" to cover a variety of measures by which Federal tax revenues would be allocated in the large, with as few restrictions as possible, to States and (or?) local governments. Under this approach, one proposal is to automatically allocate a percentage of the Federal individual income tax base each year to State and local governments. Other proposals operate indirectly by providing for a substantial credit against Federal individual income tax liabilities for State income taxes (and perhaps other forms of State tax) thereby permitting the States to use and raise these taxes since their impact will be borne by Federal revenues to the extent of the credit.

In addition to the competitor of tax sharing, there is the competitor of direct Federal expenditures for specific purposes, such as slum clearance, urban transportation, manpower training, rental housing, health services, education, pollution control and so on—the whole range of present programs and those pressing to get on the existing list.

However the priorities come out, expenditure programs require funds. Whichever route or combination of routes is chosen, the quantitative impact on budget policy and on tax policy is obvious. The sums involved are very large, but so are the resources of the United States. Each year our growth at full employment increases our total Federal revenues, including the trust fund taxes, by \$12 billion—an asset which underscores the vital need to remain a full employment economy. Hopefully, the Post-Vietnam climate will permit defense expenditures to drop to lower levels, thereby releasing budget space so to speak to these domestic areas. We will have to carefully weigh the balance to be struck between the levels of Federal tax burden, and thus the consequent amount of Federal expenditures, and the income of the private sector. This balance between private sector and public sector will involve many considerations—the combination of profit incentives, savings and consumer demand needed to achieve a continuing full-employment economy; the degree to which the private sector can effectively participate in solving our urban crisis and other social problems; the degree and rate at which Federal funds can be wisely spent.

In making these decisions we should keep in mind that taxes absorb a smaller portion of gross national product in the United States than in any other industrialized country with the exception of Japan and Switzerland—in 1966 it was 28.9 percent of GNP in the United States compared to, for example, 38.6 percent in France, 34.8 percent in Germany, and 31.3 percent in the United Kingdom. We rank about twelfth among the industrialized countries. (This is not the place to consider whether there is a clear association between the level of taxes and the rate of growth in these economies—a recent study concluded that the data permit no clear-cut support or refutation of any deductive argument one chooses to pronounce about that relationship. And thinking back to the earlier discussion on sales taxes and poverty, there is the same lack of data on the relationship between the proportion of

direct and indirect taxes and growth rates. While many in the United States are fond of pointing to the greater proportion of indirect taxes in European economies and saying we should emulate them, there is just as much cause on grounds of economic growth (and more on grounds of equity) to say they should emulate us). But an interesting statistic not usually considered is that, with defense expenditures excluded, the United States spends considerably less of its tax revenues on domestic programs than do those countries.

We cannot measure the welfare of the American people by the smallness of the taxes that they pay. At the present time they would be treated ill if we were to hold taxes down and forgo the 10 percent surcharge but leave them with accelerating inflation, climbing interest rates, an unstable boom, and a weakening of our international economic and financial position. And in the future they will be badly served if we were to press for lower and lower tax burdens but leave our country with the unfairness and ills of poverty and with the urban neglect and other social blights that we see today.

Expenditures and efficiency—and tax incentives

Any sober appraisal of our needs in the future will certainly enforce the view that there is no room for wastage and inefficiency in our expenditure programs. Our resources are very large but not so large that they can be spent wastefully. Expenditure control in the sense of a careful appraisal of the costs and benefits of alternative programs must be a constant feature of our budget policy. And we must clearly learn more about techniques to measure the costs and benefits of social programs to enable us to apply such expenditure control wisely.

A significant part of expenditure control must be a willingness to openly recognize the amounts being expended by Government, and not to bury amounts by disguising them. The Federal Government can expend funds in many ways—through direct grants, through guarantees, through loans, through interest subsidies, and through tax incentives and preferences. Unless the Federal cost is identified no matter what the route, then there will inevitably be a drive to use the route that keeps the cost hidden.

The interest expressed in some quarters today for tax incentives to cure social problems can dangerously weaken our ability both to control Federal expenditures and to make them efficient, in addition to the damage it would do to our tax structure.

We of course do have tax subsidies presently existing in our tax laws. I have elsewhere observed that through deliberate departures from accepted concepts of net income and through various special exemptions, deductions and credits, our tax system does operate to affect the private economy in ways that are usually accomplished by expenditures—in effect to produce an expenditure system described in tax language. I call these items "tax expenditures," and indicated that the amounts spent—i.e., the tax revenue lost—through these tax expenditure programs should be set forth in a meaningful way in the Federal Budget. We would thereby be able clearly to see what are the total Federal funds going to the various activities affected, and not just the amounts shown in the Budget as direct appropriations and expenditures. For these tax expenditures can be classified along customary budgetary lines: assistance to business, natural resources, agriculture, aid to the elderly, medical assistance, aid to charitable institutions, and so on. Moreover, the amounts involved are quite large, reaching in several of these areas into the billions.

Since the tax expenditure programs are imbedded in the revenue side of the Budget and their cost is not disclosed, they go essentially unexamined for long periods, in contrast with direct expenditures. Their efficiency, in the sense of benefits obtained for Government and the public as compared with amounts expended, is thus not compelled to meet the rigid tests we are now developing and applying to direct Budget expenditures. They are not affected by Congressional efforts to obtain "expenditure reduction"—they are outside the scope of the \$6 billion reduction in the pending tax bill. They thus fall in the class of the uncontrollable expenditures of Government. I doubt that any of these special tax treatments could stand the scrutiny of careful program analysis, and I doubt that if these were direct expenditure programs we would tolerate for very long the inefficiencies that such program analysis would reveal.

Moreover, these inefficiencies have serious ramifications apart from the Budget. They have caused some activities, such as building construction and ownership for example, in many cases to be engaged in solely on an after-tax basis. But a business in which the before-tax profit is low or meaningless and which becomes attractive only because special tax treatment for that business makes the after-tax profit quite attractive must surely give us pause as to the justification for the tax incentive and the way it is provided. Especially is this so since the after-tax profit is attractive only for those who have income from other activities sufficient to permit full utilization of those special benefits. In large part this situation compounds our problems in the housing field, for it is difficult to achieve efficient use of direct Government assistance for high priority housing programs when the funds represented by special tax treatment continue to subsidize a whole variety of other building activities. There is irony in proposed programs to promote private housing for the poor and low income groups by providing tax benefits that would enable doctors and lawyers and other investors to become tax millionaires through these benefits. We should be able to do better than that in our use of Government funds, even in solving social problems.

This does not mean that private enterprise should not participate in social programs and earn a proper profit. Indeed, as many in business themselves feel, the best way for business to participate is through the profit motive. Nor of course does this mean that Government should avoid participation in these social programs. There is no inconsistency between the participation of business functioning as business—to earn a profit—and Government functioning as Government to obtain those business services which private consumers cannot themselves obtain. Government spends huge sums for defense materials and services and business participates as business in supplying the items sought. Our space program functions in the same manner. Neither requires a tax incentive to obtain the participation of business. If we do not grant tax credits to those who build space capsules when we need them, or planes, or guns, or other weapons, why must we grant tax credits to companies to provide the manpower training we need, or build the plants in the distressed areas, or build the houses we want? Why should business falter and forget its traditions and functions when it comes to its role in meeting our social goals? Why should it cease to stress fair profits and recompense as the basis of its participation and instead stress tax incentives?

We are entering into an era in which Government will be seeking to purchase new types of goods and services from the business community—in manpower training, in housing, in urban development, and so on. There is no reason why Government and business should not seek to utilize and adapt for

these fields the experience and techniques developed in achieving successful purchasing programs in defense, space and other areas of Government procurement. The President's recommendations on hard core unemployment follow this path. Moreover, other techniques can be devised. If a Government subsidy in the form of a grant is needed in connection with a project on which there is no direct Government procurement, then companies bidding on the project can state the subsidy they think necessary and the contract can go to the bidder who needs the lowest subsidy.

CONCLUSION

I have attempted to describe some of the current events that could well affect the legislative involvement in the tax field in the years ahead. As in any other field concerning Government, issues are difficult to resolve and the solutions hard to shape. We clearly need all the data and analysis that can be made available to assist in meeting these problems. We in the Treasury do our best to prepare for the future and to see that information will be at hand when the legislative involvement occurs. But our resources are few indeed and our knowledge and wisdom have their limits.

The task of preparation is thus a task for all who have a concern for the wise solution and who have experience, information and insight to contribute to that solution. Among the great resources of our country is its diversity of talent and experience in so many sectors and institutions—business, labor, government, academic, foundations, social organizations, and many more—and the ability through so many avenues of calm interchange to explore and compare our knowledge. And so there is hope that in the tax field, as elsewhere, working together we will achieve the wisest solutions that our collective knowledge can provide.

NATION'S BUSINESS MAGAZINE REPORTS ON WHAT THE VOTERS WANT NOW

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very highly respected magazine, *Nation's Business*, in its June 1968 edition, carries an excellent article on what constituents are telling their Congressmen.

I should like to place in the *RECORD* today the report on a visit made to my district by *Nation's Business* editor, Vernon Louviere, who spent several days with me as I met with my constituents and got their reactions to the current mood of America.

I believe Mr. Louviere has done an excellent job in reporting the mood of the people in my district, whom I believe represent an excellent cross-section of America.

I am most pleased that my district was singled out by *Nation's Business*, and would like to share with my colleagues this excellent report by Mr. Louviere, which follows:

CONGRESSMEN AT HOME: WHAT THEY SAY AND HEAR

What are Congressmen saying to their constituents when they go back home?

What are constituents saying to Congressmen?

As riots flare in the cities, costs climb, political campaigns heat up, what is the mood of the people?

Are they openly upset? Concerned? Hopeful everything will work out in the end?

The problems of the cities differ in some respect from the problems of the nation's rural areas. But the major issues that confront the nation as spring turns into summer affect all.

To find out what Congressmen are saying to the people on a trip back home—and what people are saying to Congressmen—*Nation's Business* editors Wilbur Martin and Vernon Louviere followed Rep. Robert B. (Bob) Mathias, a freshman Republican from a predominantly agricultural California area, and Rep. Roman C. Pucinski, a Democrat from Chicago.

Each week in Chicago four-and-a-half blocks of residential area change hands with whites moving out and Negroes moving in.

Some of this is caused by "blockbusting." Some by the steady pressures for living space brought on by the inexorable influx of Negroes into Chicago from the South.

Many of these displaced white people are moving into the suburbs. But some—those who cling to city living—manage to find housing in other parts of Chicago.

Over the past few years many of these white displaced families have settled in a pleasant, middle-class section of Northwest Chicago near the suburban community of Norridge.

This area encompasses the Eleventh Congressional District of Democratic Rep. Roman C. Pucinski who is now campaigning for a sixth term in office.

Ethnically, the Eleventh Congressional District is a microcosmic melting pot with almost equal numbers of Poles, Jews, Irish, Germans and Scandinavians. It has no Negroes.

On April 10, for the first time in his 10 years in Congress, Rep. Pucinski voted against civil rights legislation. He voted against the open housing bill.

That vote was taken right after the riots, looting and arson struck Chicago and scores of cities across the country.

Before this latest outbreak of racial violence Mr. Pucinski's constituents almost unanimously regarded the war in Viet Nam as the major unsettling issue in this country. Today, they are primarily worried about the race problem.

Congressman Pucinski, a reporter for the *Chicago Sun-Times* for 20 years, has a good feel for what his voters are thinking. He talks to them constantly. He spends every weekend in Chicago. His office on Milwaukee Avenue is always open.

A *Nation's Business* editor spent some time with the Congressman recently in Chicago to try to capture the mood of his voters. It was apparent many of them are disturbed. But riots and war are not the only things. They are also unhappy with inflation, high taxes, demonstrations on college campuses and the jet noise from nearby O'Hara International airport.

VICTIM OF RIOTS

Robert J. Klein called at the Congressman's office on a Saturday morning. He knew what the riots were all about. His men's clothing store on West Madison Street, in the heart of the ghetto, was picked clean of merchandise and then set to flame. He lost everything.

"I don't feel I am a victim of the area but a victim of the times," Mr. Klein said in an interview later. He was not particularly bitter. "I don't think I can go back now. I just don't feel that the city government or the federal government gives a damn if I go back."

In the wake of the paralyzing blizzard in Chicago in 1967 there was some looting on the West Side. It was a signal that something was wrong. Mr. Klein and a group of neighborhood merchants called a meeting.

"I said perhaps we were at fault, that we were not taking enough interest in the area," he recalled. "If we were really interested in

staying there we would have to devote more of our time to the neighborhood. We'd have to get interested in its politics."

The merchants organized baseball and basketball teams for the ghetto Negroes. A start was being made.

"I know now it was not enough," Mr. Klein says today. "Because we were white businessmen we were the first to be attacked."

He believes the assault in his area might have been blunted had the city acted differently.

Marshall High School, a block from his store was ordered to remain open the day after Dr. King's death.

After a series of incidents in the school, classes were dismissed at 10 o'clock on that Friday morning and some 7,000 youngsters poured out into the neighborhood.

The trouble began with these youngsters. First, rocks hurled through display windows. Then the looting.

"Some of these kids came in and helped me board up the windows," Mr. Klein explained. "They were not all bad. But the situation soon got out of hand. The police were not equipped to handle what happened and they soon lost control of the mob."

On Milwaukee avenue, strolling through the business district, Congressman Pucinski talked with other voters.

They did not share Mr. Klein's experience but they share some of his feelings.

Mrs. Grant Dace Jr., a housewife, was somewhat typical. She said:

"The racial problem is our most difficult problem. It causes us the most unrest. I think everybody—at least most of the people I know—are trying to be fair but we feel we are being taken advantage of."

DRAFT CARD BURNERS

Mrs. Dace, who is married to a photolithographer, can't understand why protesters have so much freedom in this country. Especially draft card burners.

Inflation and high taxes bother her, too. "A salary hardly goes anywhere any more," she complained. "I know there's so much waste in government. Everybody knows this. But what can you do?"

In a Woolworth variety store Mr. Pucinski introduced himself to the manager, James E. Otto. Mr. Otto is a hard-liner, both on the war and the race issue.

"As far as I am concerned when you have riots and looting you should meet force with force. People must abide by the law. The only thing some of these people understand is force. I agree with Daley (Chicago Mayor Richard Daley who said police should kill arsonists and maim looters). He was completely justified. We can't tolerate this kind of lawlessness."

Mr. Otto on the war: "I strongly feel we shouldn't back down and let aggression take over in Asia. On the other hand, I regret we got involved there in the first place."

Although he prefers not to pay higher federal taxes, he believes they are needed to curb inflation. At the same time, though, he'd like to see the government tighten up on spending before calling for more tax revenues.

Miss Annette Risoff, a young nursing instructor at Chicago City College, believes the wave of demonstrations led by youthful Americans—in behalf of civil rights, in opposition to the military draft and in defiance of university authority—is hurting the country deeply.

"Free speech is good but it's gone to extremes where these people are now openly defying the country," she asserted. "Maybe it's the state of the world today and these kids feel they better make the most of life while they can. But I'm more inclined to believe it's a reflection of the radical thinking of their parents."

"Yes," she said, "this racial unrest is disturbing. You certainly become aware of these

things as they come closer to home. I have friends with young children in school and this busing of outside students into our area concerns them. But I have to say equal rights have not been granted the Negro. I think when they have more civil rights the situation will improve."

Henry Gorr, manager of Rothschild's men's store, has been in the area 27 years. He is convinced the recent riots could have been averted and he is a strong advocate of a massive education and training program for Negroes to ward off trouble in the future.

"But I have to say, if you're too easy on these people they'll walk all over you. Mayor Daley was three or four days too late with his tough talk. This could have been eliminated. A lot of it was sheer temptation and the rioters—mostly teenagers—took advantage of the situation."

As far as Mr. Gorr is concerned the time is now to stop marches and demonstrations of any kind in this country.

"I don't think these marches and demonstrations are any good any more," he emphasizes. "They just don't prove a thing and they've got to be stopped."

In Mr. Gorr's view inflation is getting out of hand. As a businessman, he says, he has seen the upward spiral of wages and goods continue unabated with no end in sight.

"The war is part of the blame but the government is at fault, too," he points out. "We've spread out too far. Some of this government spending has got to be cut out. Take these poverty programs. Most of them are just waste. I think somebody ought to grab the bulls by the horns and shake them up good."

In another part of his district Rep. Pucinski dropped in on an old friend, Mel Cieslik, owner of Mel's Mens Shop, Inc., to pick up some new shirts.

Mr. Cieslik was vehement on the subject of rioting and looting. He has no hesitancy about cracking down hard on people who break the law during racial disturbances. As he put it:

"We need stronger enforcement of the law. They have handcuffed our police. The Supreme Court is all wrong. Yes, these people have to be educated but the first thing is to teach them that the laws have to be obeyed."

"I can't understand it. They protect doctors, lawyers and even clergymen, but who protects the businessman? Some of my friends were wiped out in this last riot. They can't even buy insurance to cover their losses."

Outside, Mr. Pucinski talked with Tom Kereluk, a 19-year-old student at De Paul University. At his age, the military draft loomed larger than the threat of racial trouble.

He told the Congressman, "I'm really worried about the draft. I think I should be given an opportunity to finish school. Sure, I believe in serving my country. But not in Viet Nam."

Politically, young Kereluk said, he leans toward Sen. Robert F. Kennedy of New York for President—"He's a little closer to our generation."

THE POLICEMAN'S VIEW

Police Officer Gerald Mead, assigned to the Milwaukee avenue business district, believes the police have done a good job in quelling riots but they need help.

"I say bring in the federal troops at the first sign of trouble," he asserted.

Mrs. Darlene Starr, a school teacher, says she believes the trend is toward more—not less—segregated housing in Chicago as white resistance stiffens in the wake of race trouble. According to Mrs. Starr, the quality of education in Chicago is being sacrificed as more and more Negro teachers are brought in from the south. They do not have the proper qualifications and training, she says, but they are accepted anyway.

"I am convinced that if we remain weak in our approach to the racial trouble it will get worse," Mrs. Starr noted. "I have seen it in my own school. A white student will be suspended for breaking the rules but a Negro student is forgiven. The gap between whites and Negroes is widening."

Mr. Klein, whose store was burned out on West Madison St., told NATION'S BUSINESS the lines of communication between ghetto Negroes and police, firemen and the political community practically don't exist.

"On the entire West Side," he reported, "there are only two black aldermen and one of these was put in by the machine. The whole area has been gerrymandered to the point these people don't have a voice."

"I went back into the area after the riots and some people told me they even saw the police looting. One policeman, I am told, went up to a store they were about to loot and told one of the looters, 'The first color TV is mine.' Some policemen who were seen walking out with merchandise said they were taking it downtown to put in a warehouse for safekeeping. The Negroes just didn't believe it."

Mr. Klein, who spent 20 years on West Madison and opened his own business four years ago, at first thought he might return to the area and try to re-establish his business. He said he felt if he took on a Negro partner this might afford him a form of insurance against future trouble.

"But I've changed my mind," he said. "I'm not going back. I don't think it will work. We didn't expect this trouble after escaping it last year. We were wrong. My fire insurance was dropped last January and I had to take out substandard insurance."

COOL TO OPEN HOUSING

Mr. Pucinski was on solid ground with his voters when he opposed the open occupancy section of the civil rights bill. There is grave concern in his district not only among those who were displaced by Negroes in other sections of the city but among those residents who have lived there all their lives.

"My people feel," he says, "that once open housing becomes law the next step will be government subsidies to build integrated housing in their neighborhoods."

Actually, Mr. Pucinski voted for the civil rights bill when it first reached the floor of the House. In the Senate, however, the open occupancy amendment was tacked on by Senate Republican Leader Everett Dirksen of Illinois and this Congressman Pucinski opposed when the bill returned to the House.

He said at the time he felt open occupancy would bring an unprecedented degree of federal involvement and control into every local community of America.

"It will expose every homeowner in this country to the prospect of unprecedented harassment by both the federal government and those who seek to continue the turmoil in this country," he told the House.

TAX HIKE UNPOPULAR

In Mr. Pucinski's district there is an understandable resistance to the proposal to increase federal taxes. Residents of the area have just been subjected to substantial hikes in both their real estate and sales taxes.

The Congressman's mail reflects the same views of those with whom he talks in his district.

"We are, as most of our neighbors, against open housing and it is a crime that a homeowner cannot do with his own property that which he desires," a young housewife writes. "Pretty soon why not get out the chariots and whips and go down the streets of Rome and say give us all you have."

Says another housewife, "When 10 or 15 percent of the people of this nation can close down most of our nation's schools, businesses, places of entertainment, because

the 85 or 90 percent are in fear of their lives and homes, something better be done. You've tried billions of dollars in aid, new homes, education, giving them our homes, our churches, our neighborhoods, yes, and our tax money. Are you going to give them our very lives?"

The reaction to a tax increase, however, ranks high among the issues they write about.

"A point has now been reached which is insufferable; especially when we realize that much of this money is being deliberately wasted," says one taxpayer. "Less government and more responsibility by our government officials could easily reduce the burden of the taxpayer by over 50 percent."

In a recent interview with *The Chicago Daily News*, Mr. Pucinski said, "If representative government has any meaning a Congressman has to respond to his constituents. He has a responsibility to lead as well, but where do you draw the line?"

This didn't sit well with one of Mr. Pucinski's constituents, a housewife, who fired back this answer:

"Submission to a definite wrong because it might be easier to agree with your constituents means nothing to me except a lack of personal integrity and lack of any desire or ability to lead."

IN MEMORY OF A DEPARTED FRIEND

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, last week I was deeply moved by the privilege to present an award and testimonial to Mrs. Ethel Fein, in memory and in honor of her late, beloved husband, George Fein.

Those of us who were privileged to know George Fein know how keenly and deeply his family and his friends suffer from the loss of his life. His philanthropic instincts are known to all those who knew him, particularly those whose lives were in great measure enriched by his generosity—the homeless, the sick, the young in need of education, the elderly in need of solace and comfort, and the deprived seeking a fair opportunity for a creative life. A wonderful husband and father, George Fein looked upon every human being as a member of his family.

A vice president and trustee of the East Midwood Temple, he was deeply dedicated to Judaism and to the cause of Israel. He was an active leader in Jewish Federation of Philanthropies, the United Jewish Appeal and in many other areas of human need, to which he selflessly dedicated his time, his energies, and his spiritual leadership.

There is very little we can say or do to ease the pain and suffering of his wife, his children, Jerome, Sheldon, and Franklin, and of his friends and family over their tragic loss. To them I can offer only the solace of his memory and compassion enshrined in the hearts of those whose lives were touched by George Fein.

PRESIDENT EXPRESSES FAITH IN OUR YOUTH

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's speech last weekend at commencement exercises at Texas Christian University was an outstanding commentary on the youth of this Nation.

The President made two excellent points about our young people, points with which I am in wholehearted agreement.

First, he observed that this generation of young people is the best we have ever had—bright, well-trained, and keenly aware of their moral responsibilities.

And, second, the President expressed his faith in these young people's willingness and ability to carry forward the efforts of this Nation to achieve its great destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the President's speech appear in the *Record*, and I would like to call attention to his proposal to establish a program to bring outstanding college juniors into Washington each year for direct discussions with the leaders of the Government. I wish him well in this effort, and he can count on my full support.

The remarks of the President follow:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISE AT TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY, FORT WORTH, TEX.

Dr. Moudy, and other students, any political speaker who comes to a college campus today does so at his own risk. I want to make it very clear at the beginning—I come here tonight not as a politician but as a student.

Just like you, I am here to get my degree. I am honored to appear here with seven others who will receive honorary degrees tonight. Perhaps my degree means more to me than it does to them. I am the only one who is a college dropout—from the electoral college, that is.

Dr. Moudy, I appreciate your Doctor of Laws Degree for another reason, too. As someone who has spent the better part of his life doctoring laws, it is nice to finally have a license.

So I appreciate it and I am delighted to be welcomed into the fraternity of educated men.

I may even apply for a Fulbright Scholarship, although I am not very hopeful of my chances. So I can come to TCU without paying homage to its great quarterbacks like Sammy Baugh and Davy O'Brien. Fort Worth is known as the home of great quarterbacks. So is the national capitol, Washington. The only difference is that your quarterbacks play on Saturday and ours do their work on Monday mornings.

We meet here tonight at a time when the American universities are at the center of rapid change and the center of heated controversy.

Perhaps this is a good time to reflect on the nature of change in America—on affirmations and discontent among our young people and on your opportunity to share in the on-going discovery of our country.

It is an unchanging habit of commencement orators to talk about change. The speakers who tell their audiences this year that times are changing, however, should not

be accused of dealing with platitudes. For America—and the world—are altering themselves at a dizzying speed. The citizen, the student and the public servant may find it difficult to fathom the nature and the meaning of all of this change.

But all of us can feel it happening. All of us are stirred by it. All of us are sometimes elated—and sometimes disturbed by it.

A stranger to America might well wonder how a people so active and so successful can be so troubled.

Why do we take so little comfort in the undeniable triumphs of the past few years? Why do we scarcely seem to notice how far we have come—and in how short a time—toward solving problems that have plagued our democracy for generations?

In these past three years, a stranger might point out, America has brought the franchise to almost a million citizens who had been systematically denied the right to vote.

In this Administration alone, the nation's economy—and our common efforts to conquer want—have lifted more than eight million citizens up from poverty; created more than seven million new jobs; cut unemployment to the lowest level in fifteen years; and increased the real income of the average American, after taxes, by more than 20%.

In a few years, the Congress has broken the deadlock of years and pioneered new programs in health, in education, in consumer protection, in conservation, in civil rights. Your own Senator Yarborough and Tiger Teague and others have supported the leadership in this field.

Yet for all this accomplishment, the American people are anything but satisfied. We are, as countless orators and observers remind us, a restless nation.

Why? Part of the answer lies, I believe, in the very progress we have made. For a nation—as for an individual—success brings its own problems and raises its own vexing questions.

More than a century ago, a shrewd French visitor to our shores made this observation:

"The sufferings that are endured patiently, as being inevitable, become intolerable—at the moment it appears that there might be an escape. Reform, then, only serves to reveal more clearly what still remains oppressive, and now all the more unbearable. The suffering, it is true, has been reduced—but one's sensitivities have become more acute."

Certainly our sensitivities have become more acute. We are today more keenly aware of lingering poverty amid our growing wealth—of public squalor amid private luxury. Our people, especially our younger people, are more impatient than ever with "what still remains oppressive"—with racial injustice, urban decay, outworn institutions, bitterness and war between nations.

By almost every measure, we have moved closer—much closer to solving our problems. But although some of the solutions are in sight, many of them remain frustratingly beyond our reach. With all our advances in computer technology, we are still unable to set a precise date for the arrival of equality, the advent of peace, the curing of old ills and the healing of old wounds.

As President Kennedy put it, we are destined—all of us—"to live out most, if not all, of our lives in uncertainty and challenge and peril."

How should we face that uncertainty? Will we master an uncertain age, or let it overwhelm us?

Have we the strength, the tolerance, the vitality—and the faith—to weather the "burden and the heat of the day"?

Much depends on the answer your generation gives. And sometimes, that is not encouraging.

Today, as in every time in our history, there are those who doubt the power of our democracy to make early and significant progress.

There are extremists whose aim is to rule—or to wreck. They speak only in slogans, sometimes they are deaf—deaf to reasoned reply. They are chiefly united in the certainty with which they advance their views—and in the vehemence with which they mock the views of others.

Theirs is not the spirit of liberty—which Judge Learned Hand once defined as "the spirit which is not too sure that it is right."

Thomas Jefferson, the drafter of the Declaration of Independence, the philosopher of individual liberty and the defender of individual conscience, wrote a kinsman in 1808 that public men,

"should from all student disputants keep aloof, as you would from the infected subjects of yellow fever or pestilence. Consider yourself, when with them, as among the patients of Bedlam, needing medical more than moral counsel. Be a listener only, keep within yourself the habit of silence, especially on politics. In the fevered state of our country, no good can ever result from any attempt to set one of these fiery zealots to rights, either in fact or principle. They are determined as to the facts they will believe, and the opinions on which they will act. Get by them, therefore, as you would by an angry bull; it is not for the man of sense to dispute the road with such an animal."

I might point out that Thomas Jefferson wrote this during the last year of his Presidency.

It would be interesting to compare his views with those privately expressed by several modern presidents in recent weeks.

But my purpose, this evening, is to talk about change—and those who glorify violence as a form of political action are really the best friends the status quo ever had. They provoke a powerful conservative reaction among millions of people. They inspire, among many people, a blind allegiance to things as they are—even when those things ought to be changed.

But though they are great in volume, these young totalitarians of opinion are few in number among America's graduating classes this Spring.

For almost forty years—since I was graduated from a small college down in San Marcos—I have been observing the quality of each year's crop of university graduates. I must speak to you frankly, and without any attempt at flattery: I believe that this generation of young college people is the best I have ever seen.

Healthier, as you would expect. Quicker of mind, and better trained.

But beyond those things—which could be, after all, only the results of affluence and evolution—there is a moral energy in this generation that exceeds any I have ever seen before.

Even that may stem in part from historical circumstance. Most of those who are graduating from college now have had a degree of leisure, in which to contemplate the society around them. Most have had a measure of confidence in their ability to secure a prosperous place in that society. And so they have been spared the pressure of meeting society's demands—of shaping themselves to be acceptable to a very restricted job market.

However it has come about, they have had an opportunity to look at their country—at its institutions, its people, its promise, and its performance.

You have had a chance to feel the force of change in modern life—even if you—like the rest of us—cannot entirely comprehend it. You have already experienced the impersonality of modern institutions—that affords you a degree of privacy, while it some-

times deprives you of a sense that you count.

You know that your chances for long and prosperous lives have never been better.

Your life expectancy is far from what the graduate was of yesteryear. But you wonder whether you will continue to live side by side with desperate want, ugliness and with racial animosity.

You know that your country is the most powerful nation on earth. But you wonder how its power, and its idealism, may help to bring peace to a tormented world.

These are not new concerns. What is new is the desire of the young college graduates today to ask the right questions—and the desire of your country to try to find the right answers.

Here are some of the questions I hope you will ask—and then I hope you will take part in answering them:

How can the quality of education be improved—not only in ghetto classrooms, but throughout the nation's educational system, from pre-school to graduate school? From Head Start to adult education?

How can education be improved?

What are the best means of helping our poor to lead more secure and productive lives?

How can good medical care be provided at reasonable cost to every citizen in our land?

How can the transportation of people be made safer, swifter, less frustrating, more efficient?

How can we take advantage of technological change, and the economy of massive enterprises, without submerging the individual?

How can we best help the people of underdeveloped world in their struggle against poverty?

How can we help the world—and help ourselves—find rational solutions to conflict, and end the threat of a nuclear war?

These are formidable questions. You may feel ill-equipped to deal with them. I assure you that I do.

But they must be answered, if conditions in our country and the world are to change—in a manner that will serve man, and not master him.

And it is your generation that must answer them.

You must begin now—in industry, in government, in universities, in politics, in private life—to examine the alternatives, to seek the programs, the politicians, and the public support for progressive change.

I believe that leaders in government can contribute to the education of this college generation. I should like to see outstanding leaders from the junior classes in the colleges all over America come to Washington each year, for direct discussions with government leaders on these key issues of our times that we must find the answers to. I would like to see them spend, without losing credit, a month to six weeks in Washington each Spring—deepening their understanding of the problems and prospects we face.

I have called, at present, upon the White House fellows—young citizens who have served a year at the highest levels of our government—to develop a plan for accomplishing this, and to submit their plan to me in the early Fall.

It is a time to widen the opportunities for excellence. It is a time to widen the opportunities for service in public affairs. I have tried to do this in a number of ways:

Through VISTA, Volunteers in Service to America, where young men and women help those who need it most;

Through the White House Fellows program;

Through the recognition of Presidential scholars from every State in the Union;

And, not least, through going out to college campuses and finding and using the best young talent available for service in our government.

Now, I believe we should extend the range of young people's participation in public life. I believe we should move forward—now—to grant the vote to 18-year-olds.

Several states have already done so. A majority of the people and many in Congress approve the idea. The great majority of young people in America have demonstrated their maturity; their desire to participate; their zeal for service.

But we can do more than open the door to participation for our chosen few. I think there is a basic and fundamental need to open our political system to the participation of the many.

I strongly believe, therefore, that the time is already here for this Nation to recognize and to grant the right to vote to 18-year-olds. We have everything to gain by extending to these young people the most precious right and responsibility of citizenship—the right to vote.

I leave you, this evening, in faith: faith in you; faith in our institutions; faith in our country; faith in your capacity to change our country for the better.

My faith is built on what young people have achieved, in these past few years; on their bravery and steadfastness in battle; on their idealism and perseverance in the cause of social justice.

It is built, as well, on the country itself: on its ability to move out of apathy and bigotry, toward dignity for all of its people; on its steady assumption of responsibility in the world.

I know the future will be often perilous and frustrating. The past, you know, has been that way, too. But what we have accomplished in these years—and what you are tonight—tells me that we have only begun to achieve the greatness that is our destiny.

Good night, and God bless you all.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable George H. Hearn, Vice Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, recently gave a speech at Rockefeller Plaza in New York City as part of a ceremony commemorating National Maritime Day.

Mr. Hearn is well qualified to speak about our maritime industry, and his address was especially pertinent to our maritime problems today.

I include the text of his remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY

(Remarks of Vice Chairman George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission, at Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, commemorating National Maritime Day, May 22, 1968)

It is a distinct pleasure for me to appear here on National Maritime Day, celebrated during World Trade Week, in the greatest port in the world to commemorate the 149th Anniversary of one of the great maritime feats. A maritime accomplishment by the United States was the first trans-Atlantic navigation by the SS/Savannah on May 22, 1819. It was the early beginning of a long list of American firsts on the high seas and I think, while celebrating National Maritime Day and commemorating that great American maritime accomplishment, we might all

think of ways to foster the American Merchant Marine.

As Vice Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, I am a regulator, and do not have the statutory responsibility for the promotional aspects of the American Merchant Marine. However, every United States citizen, including every government employee privileged to serve America, should be interested in our Merchant Marine becoming the greatest mode of international trade. With that background I speak to you here today and address myself to the issues, hopefully to contribute to keeping America great by spreading an awareness that a Great America requires a strong and economical Merchant Marine.

We as a maritime nation, with the Atlantic, Pacific, Gulf Coasts, and Great Lakes, must realize that international trade, and the merchant fleet that makes it possible, is the ingredient that brought this nation to prominence throughout the world in the latter part of the 19th century. This desire for maritime initiative coupled with "Yankee Ingenuity" resulting in the knack to build better ships and larger fleets is a feeling that must return to all Americans. Now, during this World Trade Week we have a wonderful opportunity to impress upon all America the need for increasing foreign trade in American vessels as not only a way to make American economy stronger, but as a deterrent to our gold flow and balance of payments problem.

As I have said, the United States Merchant Marine has played a vital role in the attainment by our country of its position in world affairs. The merchant marine industry and the men who plow the seas on merchant ships have performed their role nobly throughout our nation's history. There can be no doubt of this nor that the transportation of persons and goods provides an indispensable link for the economic, social, cultural, and political functions of the world community. In the early days of our country's history when communications media were for history when communications media were far short of today's Telstar satellite, efficient water transportation was essential. The 1960's have brought far flung places on the globe in to almost immediate contact through new electronic and other devices. Travel, also, is now at a much more rapid rate than ever imaginable. Nonetheless, waterborne transportation services no longer provide the only means of communication and cannot match the speed of current communications systems. Despite this lag ocean transportation must make every endeavor to improve its services to meet the often cited "shrinking" of the world. In other words our waterborne transportation must not lag behind other important technological developments.

Rapid changes in our economy and in the world trade community, and the continually fluctuating military and political situations as to which our nation has made commitments, demand an effective and strong American merchant marine industry. For many years now the storm warnings have been up; but despite the developing crises our merchant marine, though nobly performing within its means, has not grown or developed sufficiently to meet the obligations which it must assume.

One area in which the merchant marine can and has played an important role is that of the United States balance of payments problem. We all are familiar with the serious nature of our balance of payments deficit and of the various developments and events concerning this which have occurred of late. Little is known, however, although much is assumed, as to the contribution of our merchant marine to the net improvement in the foreign exchange position of the United States and dollar retention by this country. According to the latest figures our balance of payments deficit for the first quarter of

1968 was 600 million dollars. This is a substantial reduction of the deficit of the last quarter of 1967 which was 1.84 billion dollars. In reflecting on these figures we must realize that an important part of the balance of payments computation is provided by the transportation sector of our economy. Within that sector is included international ocean shipping operations, and it is thus that we must consider the impact on the transportation sector of our merchant shipping.

In the years 1964-1966 our merchant fleet contributed about 2.2 billion dollars to our balance of payments. That is to say that as to the transportation sector, the balance of payments would have suffered a loss of approximately that amount if the services performed by our flag fleet had been performed by foreign owned and operated vessels. It is easy to see that a loss of such magnitude would have catastrophic economic consequences for our country. When we consider these facts we must also consider that the current percentage of U.S. foreign waterborne commerce carried by American flag ships is only 4.5%. This compares with the over 7% which our flag ships carried only a year ago. It is not determinable at present what impact this reduction will have on our balance of payments; but it can readily be seen that a decrease of better than 2½% in the carriage by American ships of our foreign commerce will have substantial consequences for our balance of payments.

The reasons for this decline are varied and numerous, and, in fact, too much so to be fully gone into here. I would like, however, to comment on two points. One way in which the cargo carryings of American ships could be improved is by adhering to the slogan "Ship American." Of course you know that according to the cargo preference laws of the United States, a certain percentage of government sponsored cargo must be carried in American bottoms. The private sector of our economy is not so restricted. While I do not suggest any such restriction, I strongly favor any action taken by exporters to ship their goods on American ships to the maximum extent possible. This goal is not easy of attainment at this time for several important reasons. Our commitment in Southeast Asia has required the diversion of much cargo space to military needs. In addition, the present condition of our merchant fleet leaves much to be desired with regard to availability of tonnage and suitability of service.

This leads me to the other point. The changes in transportation technology which have occurred in recent years have been very rapid, and perhaps even too rapid. Carriers, shippers, and others involved in the transportation industry have not yet fully realized the import of these technological changes, and their implementation has been, in some instances, retarded or misdirected. This has been due to excessive zealotry in the use of new transportation systems without full analysis of their consequences, by a failure of shipping interests to update their thinking at a rate commensurate with the growth of shipping techniques, and by other factors. The innovations in transportation offer a new avenue for American businessmen and potential exporters to enter foreign markets. But this potential will not be fully achieved until innovations in thinking and practice match the innovations in techniques.

It is thus easy to forecast the consequences of a further percentage decrease in the amount of our foreign waterborne commerce carried by American flag ships. It is also not difficult to hypothesize the even greater improvement in our balance of payments deficit in the first quarter of 1968 had the percentage of American flag cargo carryings not fallen to its present low ebb.

Many proposals have been put forward by shipping interests with a view toward improving the situation. While it is not for us to pass judgment on any of them here, I can-

not over emphasize, and you I am sure do not underestimate, the pressing need for action in this vital area of our economy.

I wish to make one further point: that is, in regard to the international overtones in the matter of promoting our merchant marine. Again I must say that all promotional authority *per se* has been removed from the jurisdiction of the Federal Maritime Commission. In fact, the Commission acts without regard to flag; and we are constantly alert to the danger of discriminatory practices.

At the same time, I am a concerned American citizen, as is each of you; and I am aware of the vital role the Merchant Marine plays in our economy. I cannot, therefore, entirely divorce myself from the task of promoting our merchant industry. Without a strong merchant fleet manned by highly skilled crews, our economy will surely founder, and our status as a leading force in the free world will be on the rocks. Consequently, we must all work together to keep our Merchant Marine at an even keel and as a bulwark of our economy.

ALLIANCE FOR URBAN PROGRESS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, early this May, Secretary Robert C. Weaver, of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, told the annual dinner meeting of the Greater Lawrence, Mass., Chamber of Commerce:

Top priority in our domestic programs must be to give to the poor and alienated American a greater share of the Nation's abundance.

Until we find ways of doing this, the Secretary pointed out, the poor will remain alienated and America divided.

Secretary Weaver, the man charged with devising and administering programs that must offer solutions to the Nation's urban ills, went on to say that the new interest of business and industry in solving urban problems and social ills may be the most important development in this field. Businessmen no longer say "the business of business is business. Today the top level of business leaders are calling for involvement," he asserted. "This concert of action—by the private sector, and by Federal and local government—is the only viable means to solving the human and physical problems of urban areas."

I would like to point out that the proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 goes further than any previous legislation in involving the private sector in rebuilding American cities and it deserves our most serious attention. I think all Members of the House should have the opportunity to read the Secretary's remarks:

AN ALLIANCE FOR URBAN PROGRESS

(Address by Robert C. Weaver, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, annual dinner meeting Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, Andover, Mass., May 7, 1968)

As you have all read, President Johnson recently asked those of us in his Cabinet to

remain outside the political arena during these somewhat political days. The President feels, and I think a good many Americans of all political parties agree with him, that we must devote a good deal of hard work in the next few months to unifying our people.

The President put it this way: "We have won too much, we have come too far, and we have opened too many doors of opportunity, for these things now to be lost in a divided country where brother is separated from brother."

Conciliation and unity, the end of divisiveness—these are essentials in this year in our great Nation.

And as I look over this audience tonight, I see here the ingredients for a good deal of unity.

Now I don't want to lead you on. I imagine that if you turned a detective loose on my background, he might come up with the astonishing fact that I am a Democrat.

But I am here tonight as the result of an invitation which came from the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce by way of Congressman Brad Morse.

And I have a strong suspicion that if that same detective were turned loose hereabouts, he might come up with the amazing fact that Congressman Morse is a Republican.

I suspect as I look over this audience tonight that we are, as the boys from Madison Avenue would say, a pretty mixed lot politically-wise. And I do apologize for putting it that way.

Not only are we a mixed audience politically, but I would guess the people gathered here tonight represent a broad cross-section of interests and activities in the five communities that make up this Chamber of Commerce. City officials, businessmen, representatives of local public agencies—and a good many others—are in this room.

We are here together—and I was specifically asked to speak tonight—because we are all heavily involved in the problems and potentialities of our cities. We are here to talk about how life can be made better for the people of all five cities in the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, and for the people of the suburbs in this metropolitan complex.

We have a common bond, Congressman Morse and I, because we both support the necessary Federal programs which we believe can alleviate many of the serious problems of our urban areas. It is a bond that unifies us all in this room. And I must say that it is a great pleasure to be non-political in such good company.

I would like to make it very clear, however, that my non-partisanship extends only to politics. I am very partisan in what I think is needed to help our urban people. And I do not believe we can afford for one moment to slow the momentum we have gained in meeting urban problems, just because this is a political year.

I think you must agree, for the Lawrence area has its share of those problems. You have urban blight and you have slums. You have unemployment and underemployment. You have very poor people in the Lawrence area. I am sure they feel alienated from most of us who are attending this banquet. They are the have-nots, and we are the haves. Until we find a way of giving them a much better share of this Nation's abundance—and an increased share of our respect—they will remain alienated.

We must face this fact candidly and realistically if we are to bring about the reconciliation we want among Americans.

As you know, we are having a poor people's march on Washington this summer. The vanguard of this group met with members of the Cabinet and with the Congress last week. I met with them, as did several other Cabinet members who deal with domestic affairs.

With the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King and riots that followed so close behind

us, there is a danger that we might oversimplify about who is involved and why.

In the first place, this is not simply a confrontation of black and white Americans. American Indians are there, and Mexican-Americans. They feel a discrimination as strong as any Negro.

White Americans from Appalachia are there, and they feel a discrimination as strong as any Negro.

They are the poor. It would be dishonest to say they are not made up primarily of minority groups. It is a fact of life in this Nation today that it is these groups which have suffered most from economic deprivation, and from lack of access to the opportunities accessible to the majority of Americans.

But I think it is important we keep in mind that what is being discussed here is poverty, first and foremost.

I am making a strong point of this, because I feel with many others that a priority must be given to the disadvantaged in our national and local programs. If we are to end alienation and bring about unity, then we must give first priority to the poor American. We must redress the balance between the haves and the have-nots, and this must be the first order of business.

I am not alone when I say these things. One of the most striking developments of the past several years has been the increased involvement of business and industry in local and urban affairs and with social concerns. It was only a short time ago that someone could stand up here and say, "The business of business is business," and most people would have nodded in agreement.

But what do we hear from the top level of businessmen today?

Let me give you a few quotations. ". . . Business has an obligation to help create a viable environment in which citizens of depressed areas can learn to be capitalists in a capitalistic society." That was Edward G. Uhl, President of Fairchild-Hiller Corporation.

". . . The most important domestic problem today is obtaining full citizenship—all rights and responsibilities—for every American . . ." That was Edgar F. Kaiser, Chairman of the Board of Kaiser Industries.

"We have a national commitment, shared by public and private leaders as well, to erase our slums and give all city dwellers equal and rewarding opportunities for clean, healthy and productive living." That was Gerald L. Phillippe, Chairman of the Board of the General Electric Company.

". . . In the enormously complex communities of modern life, we face great social tasks in which we in business are bound to be involved. I simply say we should enlist instead of being drafted. If we are not a lively part of our communities as citizens I do not see how we can know them as we should, and if we do not know them we can hardly serve them well." That was Frederick R. Kappel, former Chairman of the Board of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

And, finally: "The National Chamber hopes businessmen and business organizations throughout the country can extend the hand of help and cooperation on community problems, and—most important—can do so with other groups making up communities . . ." That was from Allan Shivers, immediate past President of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Sentiments of this kind have come from a great number of business leaders in addition to those whom I have quoted. They have come from organizations representing every facet of the free enterprise system. I believe that for the first time in our recent history, Americans of every background and all political alignments are in close concert about the fact that *something* must be done.

The question is what, and how we go about it.

Again, I do not believe we should oversimplify. As is usually the case in a diverse

and strongly-opinionated citizenry, there are those who speak out as strong advocates of a special group.

There are those who feel the Federal Government should take the greatest responsibility, and those who argue just as ardently against big government and for the private sector.

There are those who advocate purely local solutions, and those who argue just as strongly that national problems require national solutions. My own position is that we need them all.

I do not say this only to keep peace in our diverse American family.

Let me illustrate by using some examples of what we are doing in the Federal Government to solve urban and housing problems—which are, after all, my immediate concern.

We must have far more housing for the poor. That is obvious. At least 20 million Americans live in bad housing.

So the President in his requests to Congress—and to the building industry—called this year for a ten-year housing program which will substantially eradicate substandard housing in this Nation. This would mean the construction of 26 million homes and apartments in the next decade. Of this number, six million would be built or rehabilitated through various forms of Federal assistance.

A number of programs would be used, most of which are familiar to this audience: public housing, rent supplement housing, low- and moderate-income rental housing, and elderly housing.

In addition, there is a new proposal for a substantial low-income home ownership program. Under this plan, Federal assistance would be provided to make up the difference between 20 percent of family income and the cost of the mortgage on a modest home. Payments would apply to the interest, with the Federal subsidy covering all but one percent of the interest on the mortgage if necessary.

Another new idea is one which would lead to a far greater involvement of the private sector. There would be a program of National Housing Partnerships in which industrial and financial firms would join together to pool their investments and spread their risks over a large number of projects. There are tax incentives, and there is the opportunity to use the best private management talent and the most advanced methods to construct low-income housing.

We are even using the private sector far more effectively in the public housing program, a program which only a few years ago was looked upon as close to socialistic by many business and industry leaders.

Today we have the Turnkey process in public housing, so that we are asking private enterprise not only to see whether it can build units faster and cheaper, but also whether it can take over the management of this housing, and, finally, whether we can move toward ownership of public housing by the tenants.

Just last month we announced a new policy in our growing research and development program. We are asking that a prime contractor be chosen to work out a variety of low-cost, experimental housing projects in as many as 20 of our Model Cities. This would entail bringing together a variety of expert knowledge—in design, in construction techniques, in management, in knowledge of special local building conditions. We are, in short, looking forward to the time when we can call for a massive effort on the part of the American business community, with the help of government and the academic community, to mount a truly significant attack on the problems of building and rehabilitating homes for the poor.

We are also trying to increase our contacts with the private sector through a new Office of Business Participation, opened last Febru-

ary. We have brought General B. A. Schriever, former Commander of the Air Force Systems, into this office as a consultant. This office will provide information and consulting to private companies interested in housing and urban affairs. It is our contact with and advisor to industry.

As you know, it is not only in housing that we have a strong and continuing relationship with the private sector. The urban renewal process depends on a close working relationship not only between Federal and local governments, but, in the final analysis, on the private sector to do most of the rebuilding and rehabilitating of both private and business structures. You know about that because you have just completed an urban renewal project here, and have two others in the works.

The Model Cities Program will call upon all elements of the community if it is to be successful. This is the complete urban partnership. It depends on local planning and the use of innovative local ideas. It calls for the use of a number of Federal programs—in housing, in education, in welfare, in manpower training, in health—and for supplemental Federal funds to carry out local ideas. It will require the heavy involvement of the private sector, not only in the practical matters of investment and physical rebuilding, but in giving management help and in planning. This city is now preparing an application for a planning grant under this program.

These programs—and a number of others either proposed or existing in the Federal arsenal—clearly call for a community of effort and involvement. They are, I believe, symbolic of the new feeling which is abroad in this land—that we must work in concert if we are to solve our urgent human problems of poverty, and if we are to upgrade our large and small cities.

SUMMARY

Top priority in our domestic programs must be to give the poor and alienated American a greater share of the Nation's abundance. We must give him an increased share of respect. Until we find ways of doing these things, the poor will remain alienated. There is a changed climate in this country, so that business leaders are also calling for greater involvement in social concerns. They are calling on their people to involve themselves in local affairs, to support civil rights activities, to take a strong interest in urban matters. It is only by a concert of action—by the private sector, and by Federal and local government—that we will solve the human and physical problems of our urban areas.

BROTZMAN URGES EAST SLOPE WATER DEVELOPMENT

HON. DONALD G. BROZTMAN

OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. BROZTMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been only lately that this Nation, as a whole, has faced up to the fact that its water resources are limited, and that it is not only possible but probable that our industrial, agricultural, and domestic thirst will exhaust our supply of water, as we now know it.

In my great State, Colorado, and the other States of the Southwest, the limitations of water supplies has been recognized for decades. Small wars have been fought over the possession of irrigation water. Great court battles have been fought between States over water allo-

cations. The States have been wracked, at times, by arguments between the urban and rural interests over who should have the precious water in times of drought.

Last month, Mr. Speaker, this body debated one of the landmark bills in the history of comprehensive water planning—the Colorado River Basin projects bill. It was my privilege to join with Members of both parties from Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, and California in securing sufficient support for the bill that it passed without substantial opposition.

This bill not only will benefit all of the States of the Southwest United States, but the Nation as a whole will realize tremendous dividends. It would require pages to enumerate these national benefits, but I will mention two which are of towering importance.

The development of vast deposits of oil shale now seems assured, due to the availability of water for industrial and domestic requirements; this will guarantee the Nation several centuries of plentiful carbon fuel and petrochemical by-products.

And vast new recreational areas will be developed, thanks to reservoirs which will be built, and roads which will be opened. The Nation has few more pressing requirements, insofar as its pursuit of a life of comfort and dignity for all of its citizens is concerned.

But important as the Colorado River Basin projects are, they concern only a portion of the water resources of the West. This legislation had a direct bearing on the watersheds which ultimately channel into the Gulf of California. Meanwhile, other great river systems—some of them highly developed, some relatively undeveloped—must receive the attention of Congress in the years to come if we are to keep ahead of our great national thirst for water.

Colorado has a direct interest in perhaps more of the river system development programs than any other State in the Union for, despite the semiarid nature of our most populous areas, the high country of Colorado is the mother of not only the Colorado River but also the Rio Grande, the Arkansas, and both the North and South Platte Rivers.

In the years to come, Mr. Speaker, the South Platte River will come to the attention of Congress many times, and I will be seeking support for projects which, in my district, are just as important as were the Colorado River Basin projects.

So that the Members may have some background on the South Platte River Basin and some of the projects which we will be bringing to the floor for authorization and funding, I will now present a brief status report.

The South Platte River and its tributaries are the bringers of both life and death in my district. No doubt all of the Members are familiar with the terrible floods which devastated the South Platte River in 1965. The death toll was greater than that of the recent Washington riots, and the property damage exceeded Washington's by 30 times. We are well along the way to controlling the flood

potential of the South Platte and its principal tributaries. The Chatfield project, located in my district, upstream from Denver, is underway and enjoys a high priority among the Nation's flood control projects. The Mount Carbon project, located on Bear Creek in my district upstream from its junction with the South Platte, is awaiting authorization—hopefully as part of the Public Works Committee's omnibus flood control bill.

However, important as all of these life-saving projects are to the future of Colorado, I am today addressing most of my attention to the lifegiving aspect of the South Platte River. For it is going to require the full resources of State and local governments in Colorado, as well as that of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, to make the substantial water supply of the South Platte River and its tributaries—and perhaps even augmentation from other basins—to meet the water requirements of the next two decades in northern Colorado.

The development of the water resources of the South Platte River on the northeastern plains of Colorado is moving forward satisfactorily. This was evidenced last week when my colleague from the Fourth District of Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] introduced—and I cosponsored—a bill for authorization of the Narrows unit of the South Platte River. This project, which has been under active study for a number of years, will have the primary purpose of impounding the waters of the South Platte during surplus-runoff years for later use. It will also afford a measure of flood protection for the communities along the South Platte into Nebraska.

Now that the Narrows unit is moving ahead, I plan to ask my colleagues from Colorado to join with me in securing authorizing legislation for a feasibility study for yet another South Platte River Basin water conservation unit—a broadly drawn set of proposals referred to by the Bureau of Reclamation as the Front Range unit.

Basically, the Front Range unit study would consider the feasibility of constructing reservoirs and other facilities which would increase the supply of water for domestic and industrial use for such cities as Boulder, Longmont, Loveland, Fort Collins, Greeley, Estes Park, Broomfield, Lafayette, and Louisville, Colo.

A number of possible reservoir projects on Boulder, the St. Vrain Creeks and the Cache la Poudre River would be examined. Augmentation possibilities, improved reuse techniques, and techniques for cutting losses from seepage and evaporation in existing and proposed reservoirs and canals, would be examined.

Flood control benefits to be derived—while a secondary consideration—would be defined.

The water supply problems facing these communities is severe.

For example, despite extensive and expensive water supply facilities installed over the years by the two principal cities of Boulder County—Boulder and Longmont—the Bureau of Reclamation says their water requirements are assured for no more than 15 years. And 15 years is

a very short span in the context of city planning.

And the Bureau of Reclamation indicates that three of the smaller communities of Boulder County—primarily Broomfield, Lafayette, and Louisville—will probably need additional water within 10 to 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, I think the final paragraph of the conclusions in a reconnaissance report released by the Bureau of Reclamation last year summarizes the situation with unusual terseness and clarity. The report said:

The reconnaissance investigation of water resource developments in the St. Vrain Creek basin reveals that full development in the St. Vrain Creek basin, coupled with water resource development plans for the Cache la Poudre River . . . will not suffice to meet the increasing demands of Boulder, Longmont, Ft. Collins, Estes Park, and Loveland. It is apparent that full utilization of Eastern Slope sources, complemented by additional sources from outside the basin, will be needed to serve demands by 1995.

The report then recommended that:

Feasibility studies be initiated at the earliest possible date to determine the most economical source of water to supply the needs of these Eastern Slope communities directed toward determining the most economic and desirable order of development to keep pace with water needs.

The next move, Mr. Speaker, will be up to Congress. It is my hope that we can assist the dynamic and growing communities of my district and adjacent areas by authorizing the feasibility study which is so urgently needed.

IN MEMORIAM—LURLEEN BURNS WALLACE

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, in the days since the death of Gov. Lurleen B. Wallace, much has been said of her courage, her humility, and her understanding. Alabama's poet laureate, Bert Henderson, has recently expressed the feelings of all Alabamians in his poem "In Memoriam: Lurleen Burns Wallace."

In tribute to our late Governor, I insert in the RECORD Mr. Henderson's eulogy:

IN MEMORIAM—LURLEEN BURNS WALLACE
Words are futile that would eulogize
The greatness of a spirit that no more
Will walk among her people—she who bore
The duties of her office with a wise
And understanding heart. With fortitude
She faced adversity, always to give
Unselfishly, that those she loved might live
Unfettered lives. Forever she imbued
The people of her state with loyalty
To their own heritage—the right of choice.
Proud, yet humble, she became the voice
Of all her subjects. Immortality
Will be her crown, her banner faith and love
In those she served—a deathless monument
In countless hearts—her life a sacrament
Of what she was and what she sought to
prove.

Words are futile things, yet we would keep
Her memory sacred until we, too shall sleep.

MEMORIAL DAY MESSAGE

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, the people of the town of Virgilina and its environs have for many years held Memorial Day exercises at the Old Union Church Cemetery near Virgilina on the last Sunday in May. These services have always attracted wide attention and large gatherings.

The town of Virgilina, located in Halifax County, Va., and in Granville County, N.C., is situated on the Virginia-North Carolina State line, from whence it derives its name. It is a picturesque and beautiful community inhabited by stalwart citizens of determined character who believe in a firm adherence to the time-honored truths and virtues.

The last Memorial Day exercises were held on Sunday, May 26, 1968, and was sponsored by the Union United Church of Christ, of which the Reverend Mack Welch is pastor, and by the Florence Avenue Baptist Church, of which the Reverend Clarence Bishop is pastor. The sponsors also included the Honorable M. A. Goode, mayor, and members of the Town Council of Virgilina, the Woman's Club of that town, and the American Legion and the American Legion auxiliary, and others.

Through the influence and efforts of Hon. W. L. Gregory, one of the leading and most beloved citizens of southside Virginia, and his nephews, Messrs. Charles and Gregory Poole, of Raleigh, N.C., these groups were enabled to secure Mr. Carl Goerch, of Raleigh, as the Memorial Day speaker.

Mr. Goerch is a widely known and highly respected citizen of North Carolina. His sterling qualities of character are known and appreciated throughout the Old North State, as well as throughout parts of the surrounding States, including southside Virginia. A publisher and a radio commentator, he is an able and entertaining speaker who holds the undivided attention of his audiences. Carl Goerch has read much and traveled widely. He has a storehouse of knowledge and information, with the ability to express himself in such a way as to impart and share the same with his hearers.

On the occasion hereinabove referred to, Mr. Goerch brought an unusually fine and appropriate message, which, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD, I include as follows:

To "turn over in one's grave" is an expressive figure of speech. As such, I believe it has a special significance with reference to our relatives and friends who are buried across the road from us here. Particularly is this true when they consider what a mess we have made of things in general.

We honor them for their sturdy citizenship, for their respect of authority, for discipline in their homes, for their energy and determination in the face of adversity, for their willingness to do an honest day's work for an honest dollar, their practice of thrift,

and their belief in other fundamentals that have been such important factors in the progress and development of our country.

When they survey conditions as they exist today and see what we have done with the noble heritage they left us, I can well appreciate their sorrow, shock and disappointment.

We brag about the progress and development we have made in recent years. We have the highest standard of living of any country in the world: more modern homes, fine clothing, more automobiles, better educational facilities, and many other wonderful assets. On the other hand, we have more juvenile delinquency than any other nation. Also more sex crimes and homicides.

Found on our news-stands is the most nauseatingly filthy literature imaginable, and the same might be said of the sensational stuff that is played up in our newspapers and reaches us on T. V. and radio programs. Regardless of how we hate to admit it, it is a self-evident fact that our standard of morals has never been as low as it is at the present time.

We have lost control of our young people, as is evidenced by what recently happened in Columbia, Duke and other institutions of higher learning in the nation. If such occurrences as these had taken place during the days of our forebears, the persons responsible for them would have been kicked out so fast it would have made their heads swim.

Parents no longer seem to be able to control their children. Discipline has largely disappeared from our public schools. In the so-called good old days, if a boy broke one of the rules of behavior, the teacher gave him a sound thrashing. And if the boy's father found out about it later on, do you know what would happen to this same boy?

Correct!

There has been a distinct change in our attitude toward life in general. I like to look back to the days when man considered himself master of his own fate, when his success or failure depended upon his own efforts, when he saved up for possible periods of adversity, when he was proud to do an honest day's work for an honest dollar, and when he was glad and willing to look after the welfare of his aged and infirm parents.

The attitude of so many folks today seems to be to do just as little work as they can get by with. We've lost the incentive, the urge, the push that our fathers had before us. And you know, when you take everything into consideration, I believe that work is the grand cure for most of the maladies, ailments and miseries in the world today.

One of the latest developments in an effort to improve economic conditions is the so-called poverty program. I mention this not from a political angle but as an example of our attitude toward existing conditions.

Let me tell you about a personal experience.

The kick-off to President Johnson's poverty program took place in Rocky Mount, North Carolina, where the stage was set for his visit at the home of a tenant farmer. I was present when this took place. The TV antenna was taken down, the children were told to wear their poorest clothing, the whole house was in some disorder. All this typified real, honest-to-goodness poverty. The President made a speech, during the course of which he said:

"I have seen a family of 10 whose existence hangs on the thread of the food-stamp program, the poverty program, nine acres of tobacco and ten of cotton. I don't think it is a mark of God's will that they are poor. They are poor but honest. They are poor because they never got a decent break. They could never break out of poverty's grip. Our war on poverty will give them a chance, and we intend to win that war, because our objective is total victory."

Let me repeat one of those sentences: "The reason these people are poor is because they never got a decent break."

That's just not so. They were poor at that time because they made no effort to better their condition. I checked up on this same family six months ago. They had moved to an adjoining county, they still continue receiving welfare assistance, and their economic status has not shown one iota of improvement.

My friends, you just naturally cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves. I wonder if we're ever going to learn that.

Now don't get me wrong. There really are people who are poor but honest. There are people who have had to cope with misfortunes of various kinds, there are people who never had a decent break, but I don't believe they are in the majority. I've always contended that any able-bodied man can always get a job if he really wants one. It may not be what he wants, but it will be sufficient to provide him and his family with the necessities of life.

Compare our way of life with that of our forebears and I believe you'll agree that we are getting soft. We haven't got the grit, the determination, the courage, or the endurance that they had. Success in life depends on the obstacles one has to overcome. It is the difficulties confronting us that help make us strong.

Mr. S. B. Coley of Raleigh, who passed away recently, was president of the Durham Life Insurance Company. His son, Hal, became a member of the organization. Someone asked Mr. S. B. how Hal was coming along.

"Oh, I reckon he's doing all right, but I ain't expecting too much of him because he ain't had the opportunities I had."

And someone in the group, knowing something of the old gentleman's background, asked him, "What do you mean by that?"

"Well, I'll tell you. I was born out in the Harrican section of Wake County. My folks were mighty poor. I had to work from the time I was able to hold a hoe or a shovel. I never finished grammar school, and on Saturdays I often worked eighteen hours in a country store. Then two of my friends and I started an insurance company, and many days I worked all around the clock. On a number of occasions I thought we would have to give up. But we kept on struggling, and finally we made the grade, and you can see what we are today."

And then he added: "Now with Hal it was different. He went to high school and to a summer camp. He spent four years in college, and had his own automobile. He also took a trip to Europe. So you see, I can't expect too much of him, because he hasn't had the opportunities I had."

No, I can't go along with the poverty program for individuals in our country, and I can't go along with the poverty program for nations, otherwise known as foreign aid.

During the last eight or nine years, Mrs. Goerch and I have visited 52 foreign countries. We learned something about foreign aid. It was supposed to be delivered free to the poor people in various countries, but don't think for a moment that the politicians didn't make a little something out of it. The poor folks had to contribute a so-called "tax" before they were given any aid.

We were in Bombay, India, having dinner with a textile-mill owner by the name of Amersey. The topic of foreign aid came up, and here's what he had to say:

"Mr. Goerch, India is the largest individual recipient of foreign aid from your country, but if your people could just see how this aid is wasted, misappropriated and mispent, I know they would raise their hands in holy horror. There is only one man in your high governmental circles who has raised his voice in protest, but apparently no one pays him any mind."

Naturally, I asked him to whom he referred. His answer, "Senator Byrd of Virginia."

Our slump in morals has been due to a gradual letting down of the bars. And, as a result of this, no wonder that people are running wild, just as cattle will run wild when given an opportunity to do so.

A group of Methodist leaders met recently and decided to tone down their attitude of general condemnation toward liquor. A group of Episcopal clergymen in New York said that in some instances homosexuality might be permissive and condoned. Other religious leaders have subscribed to views which would never have been tolerated by those whose memory we honor today. And how long has it been since you have heard a clergyman urge strict observance of the Sabbath?

What is the solution to all this? As I see it, the solution rests with going back to the fundamentals that were in vogue in years gone by. Back to the fundamentals which helped make this country great. Such fundamentals as willingness to work, respect for authority, self reliance, practice of thrift, and old-time religious precepts.

Speaking of religion, our preacher said the other Sunday that what this world needs as badly as anything else to bring about a restoration of peace and harmony is for Christians to get converted to Christianity. And he added, "Too many people are willing to use the Sermon on the Mount as a flag to sail under, but too few are ready to use it as a rudder to steer by."

Have I been painting a dark picture? Perhaps I have, but don't get me wrong. There is still plenty of good in the world. So far as our young people are concerned, we have thousands of clean young folks, for every hippie you see. For every crackbrain in college we have scores of conservative instructors. Then, too, there are numerous good books, magazines and T.V. and radio programs. There are many loyal church members, and there are many happy homes. And also there are many folks who work hard and take pride in their work.

However, life in some respects might be compared to a barrel of apples. All the apples may be good with the exception of three or four—and this small number can ruin the entire barrel. That's something we've got to guard against. We can't afford to close our eyes to things that are undermining our way of life. Trying to deceive ourselves is like the little colored boy who was reading the inscriptions on tombstones in a cemetery. He came to one which said, "Not dead, but sleeping." The lad shook his head and said somewhat disdainfully "Shucks; he ain't foolin' nobody 'cept hisself."

Yes, we've got to be on our guard in connection with what's going on. That's true, even though we may hate to admit some of the things I have mentioned.

Memorial services like this should inspire us to rededicate our lives to Americanism in its finer aspects; rededicate ourselves to the ideals that these departed folks believed in and were ready to fight for.

I don't know whether my talk here today should be taken in the nature of being a sermon or not, but if you want to classify it in that category, I would like to wind up with this as a benediction:

"And finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report—if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things."

As a man thinketh, so is he. What a grand thing it would be if more folks would regulate their lives by thinking on these things. It would do much to help relieve the chaotic conditions that are so prevalent today throughout the land.

And we could forget that figure of speech about people turning over in their graves

and substitute therefor the more consoling thought—rest in peace.

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION CRUSADES

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, as last summer wore on, with its sporadic outbreaks of violence in cities across the Nation, a number of my Republican colleagues and I called upon the President to make possible neighborhood action crusades, groups of local volunteers in our ghetto neighborhoods who would provide leadership and communication to prevent violent outbreaks.

These colleagues and I, together with gentlemen from the other side of the aisle, introduced a joint resolution to provide the impetus for these voluntary crusades. To date, I regret to say, no action has been forthcoming. With a tense situation remaining in a number of our cities, and summer coming on again, I think it is high time we dust off this simple but effective approach.

And it is effective. Something very much like it was used last August in my own city of Houston. It worked very well in stopping a wave of firebombings. Houston Mayor Louis Welch submitted the following information to the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee in November 1967:

The Mayor's Office has organized a "block watcher" program to deter fire bombing—this step was taken in mid August after Molotov cocktails had been thrown from passing cars at various stores in Houston, mostly establishments owned by white people in Negro neighborhoods. Through using volunteers from the Harris County Community Action Association and various civic and neighborhood groups, Negroes were organized into a "block watcher" effort made up of approximately 300 persons. These Negroes were assigned to specified areas of the city and were given instructions on what to do in case they spotted anyone attempting to start a fire.

A total of 20 fires had been started in 36 hours preceding the formation of the "block watcher" program. After the organization was set up, only one additional fire was reported and attributed to arson. The "block watcher" program remains in effect in case it is needed in the future.

Later in his testimony before the subcommittee, Mayor Welch said:

The point I wish to emphasize here is that there are people in the Negro community, including some militants, who can be of considerable service in acute situations if communications have been maintained with them. After the night of the service station incident, we had 20 firebombings to follow in the next 36 hours. Dr. Blair Justice of my staff proposed a "block watcher" network in Negro neighborhoods, where Molotov cocktails were being thrown at stores owned by white persons. Through volunteers from the community action association, civic clubs, neighborhood groups, and high school coaching staffs, some 300 Negroes took stations in the field. Only one firebombing occurred the first night the block watchers were on duty and only one the next. After that there were no more firebombings.

The Houston Post of April 6, 1968, reported that the Harris County Community Action Association is hard at work recruiting about 500 local residents in Houston to serve as "block watchers."

HCCAA'S "BLOCK WATCHERS" MOBILIZED IN POOR AREAS

The Harris County Community Action Association mobilized approximately 500 "block watchers" Friday in predominantly Negro areas.

"We hope the block watchers will be as effective as they were last year in contributing to quiet atmosphere in the city," HCCAA Deputy Director Hartsell Gray said.

"The block watchers," Gray said, "are volunteers who cooperate with city officials to protect lives and property in the poverty areas in which they live."

The volunteers are supervised by HCCAA officials, he said. Block watchers operate in their neighborhoods at night to report suspicious activity.

Mayor Louie Welch and his aide, Dr. Blalr Justice, praised the HCCAA officials last August for their leadership in organizing the civic-minded volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Congress and the President ought to recognize the great potential of this relatively simple program and facilitate its adoption and use throughout the country. The time to do so is now.

TAX RESOLUTION

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the New Mexico Department of Development recently passed a resolution concerning the tax exemption of interest paid on bonds issued by States for industrial development purposes. For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting a copy of that resolution in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION BY THE NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT AND NEW MEXICO DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD

Whereas, the U.S. Treasury Department has by recently announced ruling arbitrarily overturned the long-standing exemption of interest paid on bonds issued by states and their subdivisions of government for industrial development purposes, effective as of March 15, 1968; and

Whereas, New Mexico is one of the many states which in recent years has enjoyed a respectable industrial growth due very largely to investment funds made possible by such exemption of interest on industrial bonds from federal income taxes, whose industrial progress is now seriously threatened by such arbitrary action on the part of the Treasury Department; and

Whereas, said action is in direct conflict with the expressed policy of the present Administration in Washington, to increase jobs and payrolls and reduce the number of "hard-core" unemployables, the accomplishment of which desirable objective depends in substantial degree upon availability of investment funds with which to finance new and expanding industries; and

Whereas, the aforesaid Treasury Department action will also result in reduced, rather than greater, federal tax revenues, in that the aggregate of federal tax revenues to be received, directly or indirectly, from in-

creased payrolls and related economic activity made possible by the proscribed type of industrial bond financing will exceed by far the increase in revenues accruing from the taxability of such interest; and

Whereas, a further effect of such action to be foreseen as private capital is thus forced out of industrial bond investments, is a much greater dependence upon federal funds with which to finance industrial projects, with decisions affecting the progress of our cities and towns being made in Washington instead of being made locally; and

Whereas, such action by the U.S. Treasury Department in overturning long-standing administrative interpretation of the law, represents an invasion of the power of Congress solely to make such a vital and important decision, and should not be allowed to stand unchallenged, Now therefore be it

1. Resolved, that the aforesaid action by the U.S. Treasury Department should be, and it is hereby, deplored and condemned and should be reversed by action of Congress.

2. Resolved, that the effect of such action on the State of New Mexico, and particularly upon the smaller cities and towns in this state, will be most harmful and injurious, rendering much more difficult our problem of cooperating with the Federal Government in increasing job opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed in this area.

3. That, copies of this Resolution be distributed to all members of Congress from New Mexico, including the U.S. Senators from New Mexico, to the President of the United States, his Secretary of the Treasury, and to the officers of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

Dated this 17th day of April, 1968, at Santa Fe, New Mexico.

JAMES O. ROBERSON,

Director, New Mexico Department of Development.

A VFW POST HONORS PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY POLICEMAN AND FIREMAN

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, this year members of Post 8950 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, of 9800 Telegraph Road, Lanham, Md., held a Day of Honor for policemen and firemen of Prince Georges County. A citation as the VFW policeman of the year was presented to Sgt. Vernon J. Herath, of the Oxon Hill substation. A citation for VFW fireman of the year was presented to Thomas G. Daly of the Tuxedo-Cheverly Volunteer Fire Company. Both citations honored these men for their outstanding and dedicated public service to the citizens of Prince Georges County.

This program was so successful that I believe it should be considered by other groups around the Nation to demonstrate our support for our firemen and policemen who more and more are the unsung heroes of our society. I think it is very commendable that Post 8950 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has taken the lead in this regard and I urge other groups around the country to consider holding similar days of honor for their dedicated policemen and firemen.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SPEAKS IN TEXAS

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, last week, during his visit to Texas, President Johnson spoke at the Will Rogers Memorial Center in Fort Worth. He talked about some of the accomplishments of his administration—particularly in the fields of education, employment, economic prosperity, and medical care. He related these achievements to the support he has been given by so many of the men who represent Texas in the Halls of the Congress.

In particular, he singled out Congressmen JIM WRIGHT and "TIGER" TEAGUE, two outstanding members of the Texas delegation.

Of JIM WRIGHT, the President said:

And JIM WRIGHT is a winner for one reason: Because he is always on the people's side.

Of "TIGER" TEAGUE, the President said:

He came to Austin before he came to Washington to talk to me about what he wanted to do in Washington. He has been doing it ever since—a very good job for all the people.

I can state without hesitation that these sentiments are widely shared by Texans who have come to know JIM WRIGHT and "TIGER" TEAGUE. I insert the President's remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE THE JIM WRIGHT CONGRESSIONAL CLUB, WILL ROGERS MEMORIAL CENTER, FORT WORTH, TEX.

Congressman and Mrs. Wright, Congressman Teague and other members of the Delegation, Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, distinguished clergy, guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I am so happy to see so many familiar faces here this afternoon.

This is a great treat for me, to come back to Fort Worth.

When I saw my dear friend of many, many decades here at the head table—Raymond Buck—it reminded me of the good old days when I use to be in politics.

Looking around at all of you happy people, and all of you happy politicians, I can only think of one thing to say right now. That is, I would rather be "Wright"—than President.

I especially wanted to be here this afternoon to lend my support to Jim Wright and "Tiger" Teague in their campaigns. They face a very tough race this year, as all of us do.

One of my staff, a young man from Harvard, somewhat unfamiliar with these parts, told me that Jim Wright and "Tiger" Teague are both running against the same opponent—a man with a very odd name: Unopposed.

I called in one of my staff and asked him what he knew about this man. He laughed and said, "Mr. President, you have been gone much too long. That is unopposed."

Actually, I have something in common with both Jim and "Tiger": We are all three running unopposed. They are running for the Congress, and I am running for the ranch.

As you may know, I am going to be at TCU later tonight to receive a degree. I hope this will come in handy when I resume my teaching career.

But I could not pass up this party. I am going to be a resident of Texas again after January. As I told Senator and Mrs. Yar-

borough coming down, and as every Texan already knows, it is mighty good to have some friends in Washington.

It is particularly good to have a friend who is a winner. The one and only time that Jim Wright ever had any competition in a primary he wound up with only 92 percent of the vote.

He carried every one of his 153 precincts and in two of them—I never could quite understand this—the opposition received no votes at all.

That is my idea of a winner. And Jim Wright is a winner for one reason: Because he is always on the people's side. No one knows this better than I do.

Jim and I have been on the same team in Washington for a good many years. We stood together for Texas and America on Capitol Hill.

During the past five years, when the show-downs for progress came in the Congress, there are none who have been of more help to me than the members of the Texas Delegation.

With Senator Yarborough in the Senate—he wouldn't want to admit this publicly, maybe—there is no Senator who has a finer voting record in helping the Johnson Administration do what they think is best for all the people of this country.

And "Tiger" Teague, Graham Purcell, "Chick" Kazen, Earl Cabell—and the other Congressmen—I don't know how many of them came down here, though we had several on the plane—have all been very generous and very helpful to me.

I broke "Tiger" in before he came to Washington. He came to Austin before he came to Washington to talk to me about what he wanted to do in Washington.

He has been doing it ever since—a very good job for all the people.

Tonight, somewhere in this City, there is a boy from a poor family who has made it to college. He is just one of a million and a half young Americans who would not have had this chance five years ago, but who can now pursue a college education because the leaders of the Texas Delegation, who sit at this table, and their colleagues in Congress, have seen to it that their government is interested in that young man.

Tonight there is a man with a job—a man who was out of work five years ago. He is only one of 7 million new workers who have found employment since 1963.

And for the entire labor force, which is 75.5 million strong today, our paychecks are bigger, our retirement is more secure, our working conditions are better.

For employers and businessmen, the past seven years, the last 87 months, in fact, have had no parallel in all of American history.

Seven straight, uninterrupted years of prosperity without a single dip, recession, depression or whatnot.

Tonight, there is an old couple who can face their golden years with a new serenity and a new security. If they get sick, they are no longer a burden to their children or their son-in-law. They have earned the dignity of independence—because almost 20 million elderly families are tonight covered by Medicare, by a program which did not exist five years ago, but which these men helped us to pass.

Once these all were visions—just visions, just dreams. But to the boy in college, to the couple in retirement, to the worker on the job, to the businessman in his shop, they are actualities and realities today.

Other visions have been made reality, too. Other dreams have come true, too: The child of the slum, who can not get a head start and an equal chance in life; the 5.5 million Americans who no longer live in poverty.

In health, in elementary and secondary education, equal justice, in conservation, in recreation, in farm and rural programs, in

every area where government can help people, we are levelling old problems and we are building new hopes.

Before I left Washington this afternoon, I signed into law the Consumer Credit Protection Act. That brings truth to the lending market for every purchaser in America.

Jim Wright, "Tiger" Teague, Ralph Yarborough, Earl Cabell and "Chick" Kazen—all these Congressmen at this table helped pass that measure which helps every American.

To Congressman Purcell and all the others I mentioned, I want to say we owe each of you a debt of thanks and gratitude.

Proud? Yes, we are proud. But satisfied? No. Never. This is a world of change, and we want to change. We want to improve with every change. We want to become better. We want to become richer. We want to become more powerful. We want to conquer our ancient enemies of disease, ignorance and poverty.

We want the world where every man can be free, be equal, and not be burdened with these ancient enemies.

In eight months, I will come back home to be a teacher and a private citizen again. But good men, like those in the Texas Delegation at this table, will remain in Washington, working to give substance to your dreams—working to carry on the unfinished business of America.

I know there are many of you in this group who are here on rainchecks four years old. I was sorry to disappoint you then. But remember, four years ago my subject would have been promises.

Tonight I have been able to talk about performances.

There was a little lady from the Temperance Union who once called upon a great government leader, a Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, to make her complaint.

She said, "Mr. Prime Minister, I am told that during the war, you have drunk enough brandy, if it were poured out in this room, to come up to here (indicating) on all of us standing."

Mr. Churchill looked at her, listened attentively, looked at the floor, looked at the ceiling, and said, "My dear little lady, so much we have done; so much we have yet to do."

There is so much that we have done in this country. All of us live better than our fathers and our grandfathers, those who made it possible for us to enjoy our liberty and freedom.

But there is so much yet for all of us to do.

If we can only arrest our impatience, if we can only keep our eye on the ball, if we can only love instead of hate, if we can only unite instead of divide, if we can only apply all of our energies and our talents to constructive endeavors, there is a better world over yonder for all of us.

To the good, progressive, generous people of Fort Worth, I want to thank you for the quality of your Congressmen and your Delegation.

More than that, I want to thank you for the strength and comfort that your friendship has given me through the years.

THE "PUEBLO": HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 134th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

"OPEN HOUSING" AGGRESSION DELAYED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the emergency passage and signing into law the controversial open housing bill, as a memorial to the U.N. International Year of Human Rights, has been followed by a controlled silence.

Robert Weaver, head "block-buster" speaking at an open-housing conference in Atlanta, Ga., explains his outfit will not go into compulsory full gear until after January 1, 1969. In this way there would be nothing to stir up the people against those Congressmen who voted for the law until after the election.

But his little-publicized threat against free men was clear: For those "who insist upon being the last to recognize not only the morality but the legality of equal opportunity in housing, HUD intends to pursue that responsibility as vigorously as it can."

Mr. Speaker, I include the Housing and Urban Development Secretary's comments from the Atlanta Constitution for May 30 following my remarks:

OPEN HOUSING IS PEOPLE PROBLEM,
CONFEREES HERE AGREE

(By Alex Coffin)

Housing for the poor and minority groups involves problems of money, vacant land, laws, jobs and education, but it ends up being a people problem—more than 800 persons at a metropolitan open housing conference agreed here Wednesday.

"Even if we come up with all the answers to the problems, how do we inspire our neighbors to accept them?" Charles (Chuck) Jackson, a Model Cities neighborhood worker, asked during an afternoon panel discussion.

The all-day conference at the Dinkler Plaza Hotel featured speeches by Robert C. Weaver, secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Atlanta Police Chief Herbert Jenkins, as well as workshops and a panel discussion.

A follow-up workshop is set next month and Noyes Collinson of the American Friends Service Committee told of nine neighborhood fair housing organizations already in existence with another on the way. The neighborhood organizations, most of which have sprung up in recent months, are in such areas as Ansley Park, Garden Hills and Druid Hills.

At an afternoon press conference, Weaver said that the best answer to discrimination seems to be "to change the rules of the game . . . to work with the institutions first and then let the people adjust themselves to the institutions."

In his remarks at the dinner, Weaver said, "Between now and next January, when the law moves into its first major phase, there is a unique opportunity for voluntary compliance that will not come again. We expect—and certainly hope for—a significant amount of voluntary acceptance before next January."

But, Weaver went on, for those "who insist upon being the last to recognize not only the morality but the legality of equal opportunity in housing," . . . HUD intends to pursue that responsibility as vigorously as it can."

The secretary added that the law is not enough to solve the housing problems of the

nation. The responsibility remains, he said, "to press with unprecedented vigor for complementary legislation which will greatly augment the supply of low- and moderate-income housing. . . . We cannot afford to do less in this hour of national travail."

Prior to Weaver's remarks, those at the dinner passed a resolution calling on metropolitan governments around Atlanta to pass the "workable programs" required before the federal government will approve low-income housing projects.

Cecil Alexander, chairman of Mayor Allen's Housing Resources Committee and a co-chairman of the conference with Benjamin Mays, president emeritus of Morehouse College, closed the dinner session by saying that "this is only the beginning. . . . There are those outside this room who need to be convinced."

The morning panel discussion was climaxed by the Rev. Sam Williams, chairman of the Community Relations Commission, persistently questioning J. Marion Crain, president of the Atlanta Real Estate Board.

Crain said real estate men "are very unhappy about the new federal open housing law. It will affect our left hip pockets, our families and our friends. . . . But we are good Americans. . . . and we are going to obey the law!"

Williams then asked Crain if the National Association of Real Estate Board discriminates. "We represent the sellers. We go by their instructions," Crain answered.

Williams asked if a Negro could join the NARB and Crain said not now, but the law requires the barrier to drop after Jan. 1, 1969.

Williams then said to Crain that, "It's simply not so to say that a Negro can buy a house anywhere he wants if he has the money."

Crain's comment that led to this discussion was that "anyone can buy anywhere he pleases if someone wants to sell to you."

Earlier, Leon Eplan, vice president of Eric Hill Associates, had presented a background for the conference, which was dedicated to the late Dr. Martin Luther King and the late Archbishop Paul J. Hallinan, and sponsored by 61 metropolitan organizations and agencies.

Eplan said that Atlanta's "extensive housing inequalities" have resulted from "federal policies, local policies, economic repression and personal prejudice."

Middle class neighborhoods "must be opened to middle class blacks," he said. Eplan praised those interested enough to attend, but criticized the lack of involvement in the problem by churches, garden clubs, real estate associations, political parties and banks.

Speaking of the legalities of the law, attorney Lewis Cenko explained how it goes into effect by stages with 80 percent of the nation's housing to be effected by 1970.

In answer to a question, Cenko said that the law doesn't prevent, as some fear, rejections of renters or buyers on grounds other than racial, religious or nationality.

After Crain complained that the law works hardships on sellers, buyers and real estate men "unless they follow the law 100 percent," Negro Alderman Q. V. Williamson, president of the National Association of Real Estate Brokers, Inc., said, "Mr. Crain tells us the law is difficult. It is only difficult for the homeowner who wants to discriminate."

During the morning session, Donald Hollowell, regional director of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, tied in the problems of housing to those of jobs and noted that the big industrial parks are being located in suburban areas—away from the central core where the Negro ghettos exist.

Speaking late in the morning, Dr. Jack L. Preiss of Duke University labeled as myths the notions that property values drop when Negroes move into an area, that white and

black persons can't live together in a viable existence and that public housing will solve all the problems of the poor who need housing.

At the luncheon, Jenkins spoke on the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, on which he served. He said that "the only way to control a riot is to prevent it" and that that responsibility rests on local police departments with the full support of all citizens, white and black.

During afternoon workshops, the need for a metropolitan open housing organization was cited as well as revision of building codes, more involvement by business and smaller public housing projects.

The workshop participants also called for local fair housing ordinances and laws, a permanent fair housing organization, encouragement of whites to move into Negro areas, a housing information and service center.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at present the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is reviewing the criteria it set up some time ago as a standard for control of sulfur dioxide in the air around us. The criteria, coupled with an opinion by HEW that a hazard to health results when the ambient air contains more than one-tenth of 1 part per million sulfur oxides on a 24-hour basis, drew bitter attack from some scientific circles. The reevaluation was undertaken under a provision of the Clean Air Act of 1967.

The Department's review is expected to be completed some time this year. It is to be hoped that the results, arrived at with the assistance of a 15-member air quality criteria advisory committee drawn from the ranks of industry, engineering, and scientific research, will be practical and realistic, as well as providing a pacesetter for helping clean up air pollution.

The stakes in this race are high. Everyone wants clean air—an atmosphere kept as free as possible from offensive and health-destroying pollutants. But no one wants to see industry forced to grind to a halt, nor blackouts in our metropolitan areas, nor an economy injured by too stringent regulation of air conservation applied unwisely and too soon.

This is what could occur should the authorities insist on immediate application of controls based on the earlier criteria for air purity devised by HEW. It has been proposed in a number of areas, acting under the impetus of the original criteria, to limit the use of coal, burned as fuel to produce more than half of our electrical power, to a sulfur content of no more than 1 percent—or even less.

As the coal industry knows, as the U.S. Bureau of Mines knows, and as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should know, there just is not enough coal available with such a low sulfur content to go around. Practically all of the low sulfur coal that is mined has been allocated to metallurgical use

and for export under long-term contracts. There are substitute fuels for coal, but these too do not abound in sufficient quantity with low sulfur content to meet the needs of powerplants and other industry.

Application of ordinances decreeing use of only low sulfur fuels thus appears out of the question. However, there are ways to reduce the emissions of sulfur oxides from powerplant stacks caused by combustion of coal and, thus, maintain good air quality. The coal and power industry themselves, along with such arms of the Federal Government as the Bureau of Mines and the Office of Coal Research, have been studying this problem for years. Both Government and private industry feel that they have a number of possible solutions—which already have been proven technically and need now proof only of economic feasibility.

These processes, along with a general review of the overall problem of sulfur oxides in the air about us, are discussed in detail in an excellent report published recently by the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc. In nontechnical language, the report describes more than a dozen processes tested in this country and abroad which have the best possibility of success.

The report declares that emission of sulfur oxides into the air can be controlled, but greatly stepped-up research and development is necessary to determine that the control systems are economical and do not force costs of fossil fuel burning out of competition with nuclear powerplants. Time and money are needed to carry out the experimental projects. But the battle can be won, the report declares.

The title of this report is "Research Must Meet the Demand for Clean Air and Abundant Fuels." It has been distributed, I understand, to each Member of the Congress. I hope it will be read and given full consideration by each Member.

I do not come from a bituminous coal mining area myself, but am fully aware of the importance of bituminous coal to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and to the entire Nation. In this age of expanding energy needs, coal must not be hampered in the role of supplying these needs.

The Federal Power Commission estimates that the demand for electrical power doubles every decade. It is predicted that by the year 2000, the total demand for electricity will be seven times what it was in 1965. Coal currently supplies more than half the fuel used in electric power production and, as America's most abundant natural resource, it is expected to be a major source of powerplant fuel for many years to come.

As yet, nuclear powerplants have produced no palpable proof that they can compete economically with coal-fueled powerplants. And this despite the fact that our Government has spent more than \$2 billion in fostering atomic research and development. The Atomic Energy Commission has yet to come up with a finding of "practical value" in the operation of any atomic plant. In this connection, I would like to urge anew that congressional action be taken on a

resolution I have introduced in cooperation with 27 other House Members to establish a select commission to undertake a comprehensive review of the Federal Government's role in the atomic energy development program.

More than a score of years have gone by since the passage of legislation setting up the nuclear development program. It is time that we take a new look at the whole matter and decide where we are going from here, particularly in view of the tremendous expenditure of funds for this program at a time when our Nation is in fiscal difficulties.

In discussing coal's role in the campaign for cleaner air, I would like to call attention to the fact that the industry is cooperating with the HEW's National Center for Air Pollution Control campaign to reduce sulfur dioxide even though it has not demonstrated that SO_2 is harmful to humans and animals in the portions normally found in the air around us. Numerous scientists, engineers, and physicians have disputed the argument that sulfur dioxide in ordinary portions is the big bugaboo that it has in some quarters been painted up to be.

One of Britain's prime authorities in the field, Dr. P. J. Lawther, director of air pollution research at St. Bartholomew's Hospital Medical College in London, has stated flatly that concentrations of less than two parts per million of sulfur dioxide in the ambient air are not dangerous, even to ill persons, and that he himself has inhaled experimentally as much as 30 parts per million for a brief period with no deleterious effects.

Dr. Eric J. Cassell, of the Cornell University Medical College, has reported that numerous studies, using men and animals as experimental subjects, have failed to provide evidence that sulfur dioxide alone, at levels anywhere near those found in urban atmospheres, has any adverse effect on men.

Dr. William O. Negherbon, staff biologist for Hazelton Laboratories, at Falls Church, Va., has said that in his opinion the complex nature of air pollution "seems to render a preoccupation with the sulfur oxides unduly simplistic."

Concerning air pollution and sulfur oxides, the Bank of New York Letter for August 1967, had this to say:

Our discussions with these (air pollution experts) people lead us to believe that the problems of cleaning up our air are far more numerous and complex than most Americans realize. Having considered all factors, we see a risk that the present HEW recommendations on the sulfur content of fuels may actually impede progress toward cleaner air.

Despite all these opinions from experts and researchers throwing doubt upon the hazards posed by sulfur oxides, the coal industry nevertheless has cooperated in every way with clean air proponents adhering to the notion, real or fancied, that sulfur dioxide even in small amounts is harmful and must be greatly reduced.

The industry does, however, request more time to continue its and the Government's research into ways of eliminating SO_2 from stack gases and into the possibilities for removing inorganic sulfur from coal before the coal is burned as powerhouse fuel.

Involved in this research are the Bureau of Mines, with its alkaliized alumina process, regarded as one of the best possibilities for removing sulfur oxides from stack gases; the Office of Coal Research, which has let numerous coal research contracts to private industrial firms; and numerous private companies acting either on their own or cooperatively through Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., an affiliate of the National Coal Association. Private research involves efforts by individual coal companies, electric utilities, and engineering firms.

As the NCPC booklet points out, three projects to remove sulfur dioxide from flue gases have advanced far enough for their sponsors to proclaim they are ready to be marketed.

The Monsanto Co., with a catalytic oxidation process, is operating a demonstration plant with the Metropolitan Edison Co. at the latter's Portland, Pa., station on the upper Delaware River. The process removes 90 percent of the sulfur dioxide from flue gases and produces sulfuric acids, which can be sold commercially.

Wellman-Lord, Inc., of Lakeland, Fla., utilizing a chemical scrubbing process, has operated successfully a pilot plant at a Tampa Electric Co. plant unit, removing more than 90 percent of the SO_2 from the flue gases. The company says it is ready now to install a full-sized unit on a large commercial powerplant. Sulfur and sulfuric acid are byproducts.

Combustion Engineering, Inc., of Windsor, Conn., has offered its dolomite injection-wet scrubbing process on a commercial basis with guaranteed results in removal of sulfur dioxide from stack gases and production of sulfuric acid. The firm is installing a full-scale device at Union Electric's coal-fired Meramec generating station at St. Louis and is planning an even larger unit for installation at the Kansas Power & Light Co.'s Lawrence station.

These and other experimental projects—including the much-talked-about alkaliized alumina process of the U.S. Bureau of Mines—have shown apparently that great reduction in sulfur dioxide emissions from stacks is technically feasible. What remains to be demonstrated conclusively, however, is whether they are feasible from an economic standpoint. Here, further testing and further expenditure of funds—with both industry and government cooperating—is needed.

In reporting out Senate bill 780 last year—which later was enacted as the Clean Air Act of 1967—the House Commerce Committee, on which I have the honor to serve, declared:

Research is the key to effective air pollution control.

In providing a rounded picture of the research work that has been done and pointing up what remains to be done to beat this problem, the National Coal Policy Conference has done a monumental job in publishing its booklet, "Research Must Meet the Demand for Clean Air and Abundant Fuels." The booklet will serve as a guide in this field for Members of Congress, Government agencies,

private business and utilities, air pollution control officials around the Nation, and the general public.

LETTERS FROM VIETNAM

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in these trying times throughout our land, we have those in our society who feel it is the order of the day to openly defy all facets of responsibility to our country, as well as those who take pride in burning our country's flag, or in talking treason and anarchy.

Yet, despite all of the turmoil brought upon by our discontents, it is indeed a feeling of great pride to know that the majority of our young people are not the participants of the order to destroy our Nation.

Yet, we are often saddened when we take cognizance of the casualty lists as they are released with respect to our fighting men in Vietnam. It is also most heartbreaking to receive requests as a Congressman from our young men who are fighting in Vietnam to find that it is sometimes too late to aid in the fulfillment of such a request.

Recently, I received a request from a young soldier wherein he asked a question as to the return to combat of those who had previously received two Purple Hearts. He had not received the Purple Heart himself and his letter was not intended to keep him from combat, but was instead for his fellow soldiers who had been previously wounded, and were the recipients of two Purple Hearts, but were by reason of change of policy returned to combat.

However, it is not a Congressman who makes the policy concerning the assignment of personnel in battle, since this is the direct responsibility of the commanders in the field, or carried out by the commanders through orders from the corps or Army levels.

I am also aware of the fact that there are times when Purple Hearts are awarded for minor injuries directly resulting from incidents wherein one is engaged with the enemy, but it seems to me that those in a combat area who have been under fire, and had twice received the Purple Heart, should be entitled to consideration sufficient to station them in a rear echelon area.

In this regard, then, I have brought this problem to the attention of the Department of Defense for their consideration and with the hope that perhaps they will make a reappraisal of their present policy.

Unfortunately the young soldier who first brought this to my attention by his letter never did get the chance to receive my reply, since his letter was received in my office this month, along with another letter from one of his buddies. The soldier's letter is as follows:

DEAR SIR: It is not without some hesitation that I write to you, for I realize how bur-

dened you must be with the many problems and decisions which lay before you. Among these, I am sure, is Vietnam.

There is, among those fighting this war, a very basic and real problem. I am speaking specifically of a segment of the 90,000 men (of some 525,000) who are directly involved with fighting the enemy.

These men are here to fulfill a commitment, of which many know little, but for which all fight gallantly. These are men who have been torn from their families, trained as soldiers, shipped to foreign soil and thrust into armed combat. They have been forced to watch their comrades die terrible deaths. These very men, both living and dead, are the legacy of what America and Democracy stand for.

It is difficult enough that a combat soldier must face each tomorrow with fear, that he must be harassed and unnerved by enemy fire, he must also face a similar antagonism from those who lead him.

I am speaking specifically of an incident which has recently arisen in the 9th Infantry Division. It had been division policy to release a man from combat duty after receiving two Purple Hearts, i.e. was wounded twice in battle. This policy has been revoked and a man must serve his full term in the field, unless he is maimed or permanently disabled. Since the new policy was set forth, morale and *Esprit De Corps* has been at an all time low. Men have the feeling and rightfully so, that the upper echelon of command has little or no regard for their welfare.

I have fought beside many of these men and feel they are receiving cruel and unjust treatment, treatment not deserving to one who has shed his blood for his country.

It appears that this situation cannot be remedied from within the military. It is for this reason that I write to you. Anything you might be able to do to alleviate this situation would be greatly appreciated by the men who are affected.

I thank you for your time and pray that God may guide you in the many decisions you face in guiding our troubled nation.

Respectfully,

(Name withheld).

The above letter had reached my office along with the other letter which reads:

DEAR SIR: The letter you have now read has been written by a man who was very close to me and his men of his platoon. You see, Sir, this man is now missing in action. Along with him were four other good men.

So I feel it is my duty to make sure this letter is mailed to you. And I hope with all my heart that you will try and help on the subject Rich has made.

This is all I have to say sir. And me and many others are hoping that something can be done.

Thank you for your time and patience.

Respectfully,

(Name withheld).

The parents of the first young man were notified by the Army that their son was reported dead on May 2. He had drowned while a passenger on an amphibious PT boat which suffered a direct hit by hostile enemy fire.

I commend these letters to you since I was indeed touched by the earnestness of these two young men, who while serving in a faraway land under enemy fire, were sufficiently interested in their fellow man to write, in the hope that they could correct what appeared to them, to be a wrong being done our soldiers serving in combat while in Vietnam.

I am hopeful that the condition above referred to can, and will be changed, by future Army policy.

VIETNAM: AN INDIAN VIEW

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, it is useful to see our situation in Vietnam from the viewpoint of other countries, especially when those countries are basically friendly to us, and when they represent an Asian perspective.

The Indian and Foreign Review, an official publication of the Indian Government, recently reprinted two articles from the distinguished Indian newspaper, the Indian Express, under the title "Lessons of Vietnam Tragedy."

The importance of Asian leadership is a theme of both articles. When we hear once again that we are about to win the war in Vietnam during a week when Saigon undergoes another siege, these articles suggest how we might have gone so far wrong to find ourselves facing such an apparent contradiction. They suggest, simply, that despite our "commitment" in Southeast Asia, we understand very little about our role there.

The articles follow:

LESSONS OF VIETNAM TRAGEDY

The Indian Express (February 14) featured an article by Mr. Shiv Shastri on the tragic fight in Vietnam. The article said:

"That the USA has suffered severe reverses in Vietnam is both astonishing and understandable. It is astonishing because the military power it has employed in Vietnam has been far superior to that of its opponent. Let us look at some figures. American soldiers fighting in Vietnam number more than half a million. In addition there is a locally recruited army of over 600,000 men. This means a total military manpower of over a million. With the abundance of American technology, along with what has been called President Johnson's propensity to 'overkill', the maintenance costs are high. Since last year, they have mounted to 26 billion dollars yearly.

"As against such an abundance of military power the Vietnamese guerrillas present a picture of paucity. According to figures given by the U.S. Government, the total strength of the guerrillas was 6,000 between 1954-60. The numbers started increasing after 1960. They reached the figure of 30,000 in 1963 consisting of 10,000 regulars and 20,000 'irregulars.'

"A sharp increase was recorded after the Gulf of Tonkin incident in 1964. The total number of guerrillas now shot up to 80,000.

"On February 7, 1965, the U.S. Government commenced its bombings of North Vietnam. Far from being cowed down, the guerrillas increase in strength and numbers.

"By August, 1966, they numbered 110,000 regulars and 40,000 so called 'infiltrators.' In an August 25, 1966, briefing at the White House, Secretary McNamara indicated a 'cumulative 1961-66 total' of 71,000 'confirmed infiltrators.'

"Such is the position according to American 'guess-estimates.' They show an increase of resistance after each 'escalation' in the use of American power. This makes nonsense of the official American position that the USA is in Vietnam to defend a part of it against 'aggression' from the other. It must not be forgotten that if the USA commenced its bombings of the North in 1965 it was already bombing the South. It has therefore bombed

both the North and the South to defend the one against the other. This is a species of 'compelled defence.'

"The human drama that lies behind a statistical presentation of facts does not reveal the suffering and the pathos that accompanies it. It is well known that American efforts to destroy the hideouts of the guerrillas have included the use of napalm, the destruction of 'all life' in target areas—a process described as 'defoliation,' the employment of the so-called 'nerve gas' and the rendering of water and edibles unfit for consumption.

"Let us look at the quantum of American power employed to destroy Vietnamese resistance. The Secretary of Defence, Mr. McNamara, told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 20, 1966, that 250,000 tons of aerial ordnance had been expended in 1965. The amount earmarked for 1966 was 638,000 tons. This approximates to 48 per cent of all the bombs used against the Nazis in Germany and Nazi-controlled Europe by the USA in World War II.

"Let us look at it another way. At the height of the London 'blitz,' 200 German bombers dropped 1 ton of bombs each every night for sixty nights. At the rate of the 1966 bombing plan, no less than 1,772 tons of bombs a day have been dropped on Vietnam. This is more than eight times the maximum the Luftwaffe dropped on Britain. The rate for 1967 would obviously be greater.

"In spite of this murderous rate of destruction, the NLF was able, in its recent offensive, to bring American power to a standstill.

"Where does such reckless courage come from? The answer to this question takes us back to the fundamentals of the question. The magnitude of the resistance comes from a sense of outrage and desperation in which the common man seems to share. I would venture to suggest that the million strong force of the USA is fighting not the 200,000 odd guerrillas but a whole nation. The more the USA punishes its inhabitants, the more unified they become.

"If you look at the situation from the Vietnamese point of view—and that point of view is certainly not to be ignored—the people of Vietnam are fighting to shed the yoke of colonialism. They fought against French rule and won in 1954. Then, instead of the terms of the Geneva Agreements being implemented, the Americans stepped in and propped up the southern zone of Vietnam into an 'independent State.'

"If the Americans had allowed the people of South Vietnam free choice as respects their government, even a divided Vietnam could have become stable. But the Americans wanted a complaisant government. And a complaisant government means a corrupt government. When you add to this the American obsession with communism, you not only have a corrupt government but a government that rules by terror.

"The odd thing is that what American policy seeks to curb in Vietnam is precisely that which has been created by that policy. In a rather perceptive passage, James Elliot Cross (Conflict in the Shadows) says: 'The Government (of South Vietnam) locks itself into a standpat position of fighting to defend all the inequities which gave the rebellion its first impetus.'

"Confronted with what is called a 'credibility gap' as respects its Vietnam policy, the US Government refers to the need for checkmating 'international communism.' This adds to the credibility gap. For, were the US Government sincerely fighting communism alone, it would not be giving economic assistance to Yugoslavia and now Rumania and, above all, it would not be signing all kinds of treaties with the USSR—on space, nuclear proliferation and so on.

"Another argument points to the danger of Mao's aggressive expansionism and the

containing role played by US power in South Vietnam. Were some wisdom displayed in the execution of such a role, the USA would find countries like India on its side. But you can not checkmate the spread of Chinese power by destroying the very leadership that would resist it most effectively—which is precisely what President Johnson has been doing so far.

"The conclusion is unavoidable that the means chosen by the US Government to make its presence felt in Asia are repugnant to the self-respect of Asia. Man is not a machine to be manipulated by statistics of fire power or unrelated application of concepts like 'counterinsurgency.' He has a soul and an urge to dignity which he will assert like anybody else.

"The USA has now two choices—to repeat its old mistakes or to take the hydrogen bomb out of its pocket and learn to live with the world on an equal basis. The first means further war effort in Vietnam and the possible use of nuclear weapons—even if they are called 'tactical' to begin with.

Such a course will create new Vietnams and will not exclude the sprawling masses of South Asia. The USA of course can destroy everybody including itself to 'assert its rights.' That would be silly, would it not?"

Writing in the Indian Express (February 2) Mr. Frank Moraes said:

"Nature, they say, abhors a vacuum. So does Man. The tendency of both is to try fill it up. Militarily it would be premature for the Viet Cong to claim that victory is theirs in South Vietnam. But politically and psychologically they have struck the Americans a resounding blow. Its echoes reverberate throughout Asia.

"The Americans might not have lost the war. But they have lost what in Asia is far more important. They have lost face.

"Europe first lost face when little Japan toppled the Russian Colossus in 1905. Some sixty years later Asia watches as North Vietnam in the role of David takes on the American Goliath. Whatever the military outcome, the New World politically and psychologically has lost face to the Old.

"The vacuum thereby created is far more serious and enduring than the temporary void which a military defeat generates. In the long analysis human values count for more than national strength.

"What is happening in Vietnam will alter and affect men's minds and perspectives far more than the obliteration of Hitler did in 1945. Its dimensions are global and intercontinental. They are also unfortunately inter-racial.

"By their precipitate action in Vietnam, the Americans have unwittingly brought Europe face to face with Asia, and in the process have confronted the Old World with the New.

"That Russia which was humbled sixty years ago by the Japanese should now provide the main warhead for Hanoi's rocket against the Americans is also symbolic of the traumatic change in values over the years. Today the Soviet Union presents a new phenomenon to the world—that of Euro-Asia, with one foot astride Europe and another reaching towards Asia. The Warsaw Pact and the Tashkent Declaration are two faces of the same coin.

"Is the land of the Tsars, now of the proletariat, earmarked to fill the latest vacuum in Asia?

"Territorially Russia lies athwart Europe and Asia, and from the days of the Tsars its political tentacles have tended to reach out towards Asia. China, another Colossus, bars its path on a vital flank. Viewed superficially, the struggle for influence over Asia seems to lie between Soviet Russia and Communist China—both of them territorial giants and both of them Communist.

"The question which arises—whether Asia is now doomed and destined to go Red—does

not necessarily postulate a simple answer based on a choice between two alternatives. For the battle for power over Asia is not limited to two contending Communist dinosaurs nor indeed to the polarized pulls of the Marxist and non-Marxist worlds. Asia itself enters into the calculus.

"For the achievement of North Vietnam proves that given the tools an Asian country can do the job. Japan demonstrated it sixty years ago, but in her case the tools were her own. That over half a century later another Asian country has to rely on foreign hardware to achieve the same miracle exposes the widening, pitiless, material gap between the Western and non-Western worlds.

"North Vietnam's startling success projects another fact. A vacuum in Asia need not be compulsively filled by a foreign body. Asia is capable of filling it itself. The present inherent weakness of Asia undoubtedly owes much to its own doing, to its sins of commission and omission. But the calculated policies of the West, based on selective aid, have contributed not a little to that end. Many Asian countries will draw the obvious moral and set about putting their houses right. Japan did it. North Vietnam is on the way to doing it. Why not the rest of Asia?"

A TRIBUTE TO MONSIGNOR BURKE

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the 42d annual outstanding service presentation by the Essex Council of the Boy Scouts of America, Council President Fred S. Tarbox honored the distinguished service of the Right Reverend Joseph P. Burke, J.C.D., pastor of St. Patrick's Church in Lawrence, Mass.

In his parish, the monsignor has the largest number of Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts in the council, and an active Catholic youth organization of over a thousand members. Mr. Tarbox presented Monsignor Burke with a plaque in tribute to his dedicated and generous service to boyhood. His address, "A Tribute to Monsignor Burke," is an eloquent testimony to the monsignor's unselfishness and devotion to today's youth, and I am privileged to be able to present it here for the attention of my colleagues:

A TRIBUTE TO MONSIGNOR BURKE

In a world torn with strife, bogged down with inaction and problemated from within it's refreshing to have your discipleship a part of our community.

Quoting from the Gospel according to John, Jesus appears to his Disciples and in speaking to Simon Peter asks him, "Simon Peter, do you love me?" and Peter replied, "Yes Lord you know that I love you." Jesus said to him, "Feed my lambs." A second time he said to him, "Simon son of John, do you love me?" Peter replied, "Of course, Lord, I love you." Jesus said, "Tend my sheep." Finally, the third time he asked Simon Peter, "Do you love me," and although Peter was grieved, he replied, "Lord, you know everything, you know I love you." Jesus said, "Feed my sheep."

Monsignor Burke you are tending and feeding our lambs and sheep. You are answering our Lord's request. You are doing good and great things with action, you are a "Do-er" and your "Golden Deeds," in so many ways, help our young and old. You are not out making apologies for America—

You are encouraging, nourishing and enriching the lives of so many young boys and girls. You are providing leadership to many young boys and girls. You are providing leadership to many young boys in Lawrence. You are sponsoring and making available "Scouting" for all our boys and these boys' lives are being oriented toward good citizenship. These boys are learning the Scout Law and oath and they will make fine Americans because you care.

I've been thrilled to see you here at the Greater Lawrence Regional Vocational Technical High School, late at night when a dance was in progress—just checking on the well being of our youth. Your warm body and Christ like attitude gives all of us courage. You represent a youth movement of your own. You are a great man and Christ's own disciple.

North Essex Council Boy Scouts of America is proud to present this plaque for all you have done and for all your assistance.

May God Bless you now and always.

THE UNITED STATES CAN HELP CZECH PEOPLE

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I receive copies of letters written to the Palo Alto Times by Mr. Julius Epstein of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, in my congressional district.

A letter by Mr. Epstein which recently appeared in the Palo Alto Times raises some very interesting points regarding the type of assistance which we could give to the Czech people in their desire to democratize within a Communist regime.

The letter follows:

THE UNITED STATES CAN HELP CZECH PEOPLE
EDITOR OF THE TIMES:

Since there can be no doubt that the events in Czechoslovakia indicate the most important and most hopeful development within the East European Communist bloc outside the Soviet Union proper, the question arises what the American government is going to do to encourage the Czech people in their admirable and immensely courageous struggle for "democratization within a Communist regime."

Two things should and could be done immediately: to return the paltry \$20 million in gold held by our government since 1945 and the offering of a new kind of Marshall plan to the new regime in Prague. As we remember well, Stalin forced Jan Masaryk to reject the American Marshall plan aid offered in 1948.

Secondly, and even more important, would be the offer to the Czech "liberals" who are now in power in Prague the conclusion of an American-Czech Cultural Exchange Agreement.

The Soviet government could not denounce the Czechs as "lackeys of imperialist Wall Street" since such cultural exchange agreements existed between the USSR and the U.S. for the last 10 years.

Whereas the value of the cultural exchange agreements between the USSR and the U.S. can reasonably be questioned, no doubt exists about the usefulness of a similar U.S.-Czech agreement. In this case, both countries would certainly be the true beneficiaries of such an agreement. The agreement should provide the intensive exchanges of scholars, students and artists—from symphony orchestras to

jazz bands as well as art exhibitions, theatrical groups and plain tourists—and all this on a rather broad and generous basis.

It stands to reason that the present Czech regime under Dubcek's leadership would never try to infiltrate Communist agents into the U.S. as the Soviet government repeatedly did when it sent its ballets and circuses to the United States, not to mention its diplomats at the United Nations.

A cultural exchange agreement between the United States and the new Czechoslovakia would be of immense importance in cementing a real friendship between the peoples of the two countries. The final results of such policy of a genuine rapprochement between the two peoples cannot even be guessed at present time.

May I express the hope that there is somebody in the White House as well as in the Department of State with enough imagination to tackle the task, to use a current slogan, "right now!"

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

PALO ALTO.

FORMATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently a group of air traffic controllers throughout the United States formed a much needed organization, which hereafter will be known as the Professional Air Traffic Controllers.

I am very pleased to see the air traffic controllers establish this organization which will provide a unified voice to deal with their many problems.

Few Americans realize what a tremendously important role the traffic controllers at a major airport play in keeping the airlines operating and maintaining the highest standards of safety in the control of airway traffic.

I was pleased to see a large contingent from Chicago's O'Hare Field Tower participate in the formation of this much needed organization.

The traffic control operators at O'Hare Field are probably the most unique group of workers in this country. I do not know of anyone who works under heavier pressure than the men in the O'Hare Tower and the Aurora Control Center—the world's busiest airport.

These men handle more than 2,500 operations a day at O'Hare and at certain times they have four or five runways going at one time. It borders on the incredible that these human beings can perform their duties with such precision and excellence.

Too long have the needs of these men been lost in the mainstream of demands by all the employees of the Federal Government when, indeed, these particular workers' problems and needs are unique and apart from any other group of Federal employees.

PATCO will give these men a unified voice to bring a higher standard of respect and remuneration for their high dedication to duty and better working conditions.

I am today including in the RECORD a speech by Attorney F. Lee Bailey, deliv-

ered recently at the Americana Hotel in New York City when this organization was first founded.

Mr. Bailey has put into proper perspective the work of these human computers who keep this Nation's biggest transportation system functioning with the least amount of interruptions, other than those created by weather conditions which are beyond their control.

Attorney Bailey's speech follows:

Mr. F. LEE BAILEY. Thank you very kindly, not only for your reception, but for coming. I hope that in my youth I have the good sense to avoid attempting to compete with Red Baron (Mr. Arthur Godfrey) sitting over on my left. I too recognize the beauties that are in this room but I will not attempt to supvene his comment on them, because I am sure it can't be bested.

I shall not keep you long, most of you are executives of one type or another and I think that the message can be short and sweet and yet clear.

The reason for asking you to join us this evening and to come around where personal contact was possible was simply this: there are all kinds of communication in the United States; the telephone is nice, telegrams are nice, magazines are nice, but there is nothing like a face-to-face confrontation. We do not settle disputes at remote distances or through the impersonal medium of a narrative statement that cannot be questioned or contravened.

The Professional Air Traffic Controllers organization which was indeed launched six weeks ago was not more than an idea, but it was such an overwhelming idea that it is literally sweeping the profession and will continue to do so.

Statistically it is provable beyond any shadow of a doubt. There is a great deal of unrest among Controllers. It is justified by the circumstances and they are going to move. I was very happy when I was originally asked to consult with them about the formation of an organization that they did not approach the matter from a rable-raising, union point of view wherein they could get what they wanted simply because they wanted it and because everybody else was getting it.

They spoke first of their responsibility, and their responsibilities are not only extreme but they are exclusive. By the same token, so is their control.

The word "air traffic control" has now become an integral part of commerce and life in the United States and it will not diminish.

If a long time ago when the many of you among us tonight used to fly, the low frequency range was our only salvation. In the hope that we could distinguish an "A" signal from an "N", the controller merely stood by and listened to where we said we thought we were and he hoped that we were right so that the other guys reporting a different position wouldn't run into us. But times have changed. The duties of the pilot have not gone down, but up. He is a man of integrity and he has great respect, justifiably so. In the United States he is an exciting individual who can do something that most of the citizens can't do: he can fly an airplane. But he knows, as I know, because I do it many, many hours every month, that from the time we light the engines and get on ground control until the time we reach our destination and turn off the switch from ground control, that we are directed by somebody to make every single move.

That somebody is particularly a man who is not very old. He has a background, we hope, as a controller in the military—this is where most of them come from. There is a thought that many are pilots; some are, many are not. He has the responsibility and the only responsibility for making sure that we don't run into one another, and as we

view the New York traffic situation today or Chicago, if you like, or Los Angeles, or many of the other high density zones, that responsibility is becoming overwhelming to the point where it can rip human minds apart.

Now, we all know the consequence of a mistake on the part of the controller. We ask of him mental strain that we would not accept. We put at least two experienced qualified men in the cockpit of every large airplane that is complex and difficult to fly, where mistakes are never forgiven, only recorded in twisted metal, but in between the take-off and the landing we are given some respite. We can drink a cup of coffee, we have an auto pilot to help us out and we are allowed to generally relax.

The controller will sit for two, four, six or even eight hours on his scope taking hand-offs and putting them on the ground at the rate of 30 at any given time, which is not only unreasonable but it could become something more than that.

It is not the purpose of this organization to try to create any state of panic to accomplish its ends. It does not contend that danger runs rampant through the system, but it does accept and it will discharge the responsibility to announce what the conditions are.

This is not a responsibility that can be expected, as has been demonstrated by the upper echelons of the bureaucracy known as the FAA.

The only people who know when an airplane is safe to fly or unsafe is the pilot, the man who controls, not the presidents of the companies who own the airplane. And by the same token, the only people who know whether or not the system can accommodate the traffic that is thrust into it or whether it must reject some to attain a margin of safety to which we, as pilots and passengers, are entitled are the people who are working every day on what we call "the boards."

The boards are the radarscopes with the flight strips sitting next to them where airplanes are moved from New York to Chicago to Miami or anywhere across the country.

This is not to suggest that the Organization is interested only in the high density zones; a controller is a controller and if he is not a good man, it is small consolation to tell the widow that it was a Piper Cub accident, not a 707. Small airports with control towers need the same level of efficiency because emergencies are never programmed, they always happen out of turn.

The controllers say that they are in trouble; they have evidence that they are in trouble. They have called this meeting to explain to you what their troubles are, to get your reactions as representatives of other areas of the aviation industry and more than that to get your cooperation.

They are the sole experts in that area which involves the radarscopes, and the visual aids that they have from the tower, in order to guarantee you safe passage wherever you must go.

By the same token, you in your various fields are the sole experts to complement that function wherein together hopefully on each occasion a successful passage is made.

The key to the theme of this Organization is posted behind me. We will very shortly have in print for those who were unable to attend that have interest, a national magazine called the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Journal, for the first issue at least. This is a proposed cover and probably very close to the final result, but the thing that you see there and the thing that you see hanging behind me is symbolic of what is involved; that is to say, an airplane in flight is a partnership between a group in the cockpit and a group on the ground, and the failure of either can result in disaster. It need not and should not, but we are approaching the breaking point in many areas.

The air traffic control is our diminishing lot; the government is not able to hire new men who have the necessary youth, vigor, intelligence, ability, and this is a job of high skill and resilience—the key to an air traffic controller—because without resilience he'll pull off his head-phones and throw them through the radar scope and run out screaming and wind up in Bellevue. He must be able to take pressure in tremendous amounts or he cannot do his job. There is no rule or law or directive from the FAA, which directs how many planes may arrive at a given point at a given time. They arrive spontaneously because they chose to go there. It does not appear that there is going to be such a rule tomorrow. At any time he may suddenly be hit with 30 targets he didn't intend to have and his responsibility is to get them down because we know from Isaac Newton that every airplane that takes off is going to come down. Our hope is that it will land on its rubber.

The reason for recruitment being as bad as it is has been recently demonstrated by a panic program to get more controllers in areas where they are dropping like flies; that is to say, far more than half or those who are hired for one reason or another are not satisfactory. They quit because they don't like the job, it is not attractive to them or they are not qualified and, therefore, forced out.

But some are not forced out. The controllers upon whom your lives depend and who are represented here tonight not only from New York but from all over the United States, the top controllers called GS-12s and some 13s, the ones who assume the ultimate responsibility of the minute-to-minute action that cannot be supervised by any other authority, who being administrators are no longer qualified to operate what we have called the "Board," will tell you and tell you very frankly that incompetent help is being seated beside them, and that although now they maintain the margin of safety, tomorrow that incompetent help will be taking over and that's not good enough.

They will also say that although there can be no excuse for giving less than the best, because we who have airplanes have only the best equipment and know what's at stake, they have far less than the best and they have equipment which is not adequate to meet the needs of the job that they have to do.

The reason that they don't have better equipment is because nobody apparently has had the impetus to make sure that they get it. It's available, the manufacturers know how to make it; what's available is at least three times as good as what is in operation, but it has not been installed.

Now, Congress is like any other body; I assume it has to oil the wheel that squeaks the loudest. This wheel is going to squeak. There are two alternatives, and one is to wait until the trouble is so serious that a crisis has been invited and has arrived. This is not in my judgment the manner in which a professional organization ought to act. They have the same duties to the moving American public that a doctor has to medicine and patients and that a lawyer has to society. They should forecast trouble if they can see it; if they do see it, they will mention it, and they are going to try to do something about it.

Their position is also this, and I think justifiably so, and I throw these ideas out because we very much want to hear from anybody who disagrees with them.

We cannot do very much without a firm liaison between the professional pilots, pilots of general aviation, the people who make the airplanes that plow through the system and they, by the way, are far superior—having in mind what is available—to the equipment on the ground that is intended to prevent them from meeting unexpectedly at altitudes unknown.

I have been to Atlanta. At Atlanta they have a system, although they say down there they would like to see it improved and the desire for improvement is healthy, it is so far beyond what a pilot coming into New York has for his insurance policy that I think it to be a disgraceful situation.

A common IFR room is being created in New York where all of the Kennedy, LaGuardia and Newark approach controls will move together in the hope that they can rescue one another where now separation of frequencies might prevent communication in time. Unfortunately, the equipment that will be installed in that room is not what is available. As a matter of fact, it is, in any instance, poorer than what is now operating.

A controller must look at a scope and he must view a number of targets. They all look alike unless he has asked one to identify himself, at least all within his area, and he must remember, simply through the forcing of will and memory, to imprint momentarily the identity, the altitude, and hopefully the heading and perhaps the speed of every unknown little blip that makes its way across the screen.

To watch a control tower and to accomplish this in an hour of peak traffic at Kennedy Airport where there are circling above 50 airplanes all demanding to land, asking to be put in sequence, and to remember everything that he sees is to gain new respect for the capacity of the human mind, but there is not need to abuse it so badly.

The controller now will tell you that at 40 years of age he feels he is on a sharp downgrade and that his career or his useful life has just about run its course, at least in the highest of pressure areas.

In Atlanta as one watches the scope a little tag follows along and says, "This is American 243, he is flying at 2000 feet, his ground speed is 340 knots," and his heading you can figure out. And the mental strain that is lifted thereby is fantastic.

The New York area is perhaps an apt example because it is the closest to great difficulty.

There are 2500 movements on the average day from three major New York airports and you know what they are.

The airspace that is available to handle each of them has become minimal.

To the northeast, to the north, the northwest, the west, south and southwest, all the air is gone. Politicians have spent much time arguing about where they should put another major jet port. None of them have bothered to contact the controllers who would be told that they would have to operate that jet port.

The controllers have decided that it is their responsibility to give advice and strong recommendations in this area, and if there is going to be another jet port, and there isn't time to build one any more because the controllers will not accept the annual increase in traffic at its present rate for in so doing they cannot guarantee the safety of those who enter the system, they have taken a very firm position that they will not tolerate any increases which represent a hazard.

A corollary to that is that either the traffic will halt—and I don't believe that any more than you do. If only 10 to 15 per cent of the American public has flown, the generation coming along is going to kick that up to 90. Air traffic will increase, not decrease. But it cannot increase here this way any more. It would take a number of years to put up a major new port, there isn't time to do that, it is time to open another one, and I use this only as an example, because this is not a New York club, it is involved with air traffic throughout the country and will become more and more involved in the months to come. I fully expect that within a very few months it will be the most solid and unified voice of Air Traffic Control that the United States has ever seen.

You can't put an airport in a place where you don't have air through which to fly airplanes to get in and out.

If New York has to have another one at the moment, there is one that is built that could handle all of the overseas traffic and alleviate rather simply the load that is placed on Kennedy and the other major terminals and it is sitting on the end of Long Island.

If somebody proposed to build another one without asking the Controllers whether or not it is feasible to use it, they may be wasting a lot of money. By the same token, probably because nobody ever thought of it, nobody ever came to a Controllers' group and said: "Is this practical with 18 runways going in different directions", how would you try to solve this problem?

Well, after you tried to get a 90-knot airplane out in front far enough of a 707, when you can point them both towards the outer marker, and not have one overrun the other and rule out the calculations and opportunities for mistakes involved, you begin to figure out that it will be nice to have two runways, one for 90 knots and one for 150 and those two will handle anything that is built in the United States or imported into it today; but nobody has asked, and from now on they will not have to ask, we will see that they are informed.

The Air Traffic Controllers feel, and again I think justifiably so, that in order to get the best men they must elevate their standards entirely. I do not mean by small increments such as unions visualize when they seek improvements in fringe benefits or income. I mean with one solid jump. They do not feel, and I do not feel as an attorney, that they can do this within the agency. They will in the near future approach Congress. They will ask for a new law. It will create a new Air Traffic Controller—although a grandfather clause certainly must cover those who are now in the business, because if they were all to walk out, the United States would be closed for business.

I can assure you that the Air Traffic Controller in the future should go to a college where air traffic control is taught. It is a complex business and the one that can be learned in part in the classroom.

The Air Traffic Controller should be a pilot. He is now reaching right into the cockpit, dictating headings, speed, altitude and coming up with lost airplanes from time to time. The only hope to get that airplane on the ground is that he can through his radio transmission dictate the moment by moment movement of the controls and get back from the pilot, panicked though he may be, enough information from the instrument panel to find out where he is and put him on the ground. That is the responsibility the Controllers are anxious to accept. At the moment, their opportunity to do so is sharply limited.

They feel, and I think the pilots feel, because I have talked with many of them, that hours that controllers spend in the cockpit cannot help but make them better qualified to do the jobs that they have to do, and more important, to make the decisions they must make in which the pilot cannot participate.

We all know that when holding at 6,000 feet over Colt's neck in the soup we haven't got the slightest power as pilots to avoid a collision with anything, but the controller has, and he is the one who sees that collision is avoided, and if it is not done and we are at our final altitude, the responsibility must be his, and fault, if there is failure. It is possible for an Air Traffic Controller to fly today, if he wants to give three weeks notice to go through a long batch of red tape, use his trip for a legitimate purpose in the judgment of some bureaucrat and not take too many each year.

An Air Traffic Controller ought, with the consent of the airline or other airplanes

involved, whether it be a Biz jet, a corporate airplane or a private airplane, to fly anywhere anybody will have him simply to accumulate the hours and wisdom.

I have never seen an airline pilot that resented a controller in the jump-seat.

Quite to the contrary, it is heartening to fly over New York City at 2 or 3 in the morning to listen to the airplane pilot talking to the controllers about things that may be trivial, but at least to indicate one to the other the tremendous respect that runs between them.

I have never seen an airline that objected to carrying the extra 175 pounds in a 50-ton airplane, that is required to give a seat to a controller, and I think that they should fly anywhere any time that is feasible for those who would carry them to permit it—that they should log those hours and that they should have a minimum standard so that just like pilots they must spend some time in order to know the difference between a gyro horizon and a manifold pressure gauge.

This information is useful to them when they ask one airliner to slow down or a small plane to speed up and maintain 160 knots, a decision critical to the entire pattern on the radarscope and of great moment to the pilot who stalls out at 159.

Now, by raising these qualifications, they are going to have to raise the attraction to become a controller.

Most of them are, of course, dedicated men and they say, "Yes, you know things aren't too good, but I wouldn't be happy if I weren't controlling aircraft."

On the other hand, it is not simply to increase personal status but an observation that things are getting very, very tight.

I suppose because of the initial acceleration of the kickoff of this Organization, which you might assume is a matter of business logic, appeal to a group that was ripe for something and had spent too many years hoping, but getting nothing seeing progress slowed down, that the initial conscription rate which has been at the major facilities we have so far seen, being New York, Washington, Chicago, Miami, Minneapolis, Los Angeles and last night Cleveland running 85 per cent, is a strong endorsement that the ideas advanced by the initial group which caused the formation of this Organization are attractive to all and they are behind it and they will stay behind it.

Our desire to cooperate with everybody in the industry is perfectly sincere. There have been rumors I know, because I have gotten them in the feed-back—and it is fortunate, thank goodness, that I have an investigative Bureau—that this is a Teamster front, that it is an attempt by Castro to take over the United States, and they are the things that business men after too many Martinis are apt to listen to with an attentive ear when they should be laughing; but it is no more than we have said it is: Air Traffic Controllers, and only Air Traffic Controllers, I don't mean the supervisors who check them in and out, I don't mean the people who learn the business some day, but this organization is the voice of the men who do the controlling and for them there is no substitute.

Now, we know that there are problems and controversies which arise between the views of the professional pilots who know that only so many movements can be tolerated in a day in a given airport, and feel that those movements should be dedicated to the airplane that moves the most people at one time—and the representatives of general aviation who feel that there should be maintain unfettered the rights of a citizen to take his own plane and land at any airport that he needs to go to for business or otherwise; and certainly right in the middle of this controversy sits the Controller. They have said to me, "If you give me the concrete and the equipment we will land every plane that wants to come in." But they don't have the concrete and the equipment. The lines of

communication must be kept open; there is no way any more to have aviation in the United States without a controller hooked into it 50 per cent of the time, 60 per cent of the time, and when it is IFR, 100 per cent of the time. And we are very hopeful that we will get substantial cooperation, and we extend it to everybody that we have invited here tonight.

We are also very hopeful that the aims of the organization will be correctly reported. It would be possible—do not think that this possibility is not viewed or understood—it would be possible to bring a tremendous pressure to accomplish these ends in panicky fashion.

The gentlemen that I represent do not choose to take that route, and if they did, I am satisfied that I would not choose to represent them.

One slow down in the New York area, and a slow down is defined as following FAA regulations, with the spacing required by those regulations, would cut the traffic in the New York area down to 60 per cent of its level.

It has been done by renegade movements, by discontented controllers in Los Angeles, in Chicago and in New York and its effects are disastrous, and that is not the answer. It is a demonstration much as Martin Luther King's march into Washington with many of the people who are dissatisfied. It is not the method of this group.

But, on the other hand, they have made it very clear among them, and I think that their position cannot be attacked, that they are the ones who will report; this is enough, this is as far as we can go.

If New York is to continue to expand, or Chicago, somebody will put in the three dimensional radar that is available. Somebody will furnish good and alert young men who can become controllers because this select group cannot be reamed out of society as we ream our juries out.

They are a select group just as pilots are, and that will be done by making reasonable working conditions at attractive salaries to people—who will not go otherwise—because Air Traffic Control has something to offer.

As of the moment, everybody in New York is on a six-day work week. Pilots are limited to 80 hours flying, and I think wisely so. I fly 80 hours a month, and if I did nothing else I suppose that would be a month's work.

But we do not know because no one has ever run an intelligent and well-documented psychological study of whether or not there is a safety limit as to the work of controllers at which point efficiency begins to give way to fatigue. Perhaps a 48-hour week is feasible and perhaps it is not. We will accomplish such a study on our own and we will pay for it and then we will rely on it.

These are some of the things that we will report to the Congress when we ask for a sweeping change in the law.

There is a maximum in aircraft instructions and you pilots know it well.

Some people can fly Piper cubs, some people can fly light twins, some people can fly the Lear jets and some people can fly 707s. Presumptively some day we will have people who can fly the SST, but at a given level some pilots drop off, not because they don't know aviation, not because they don't know what the controls look like and feel like, but because they can no longer keep up with the airplane. It moves too fast and their ability to think, reason and decide begins to fall behind the movement of the machine.

We see it happen all the time trying to transition people from light aircraft into a Lear jet, as I have to do.

There is no such thing as being "with" an airplane.

You are ahead of it or you are behind it, and when you are behind it, the only communication that will be useful will be with the life insurance representative, the attorney who has your will and the funeral director.

It perhaps would be unfair to say, because it could be misinterpreted by the public and hurt aviation generally, which the controllers have absolutely no desire to do—but to the contrary, that we are behind the system—that we are perilously close to being even with it in certain areas and being even with it is a fiction that means you can handle everything but the emergency; and we should handle the emergencies and handle them well.

I put to you an example: Some time ago Eastern Airlines and Trans World met unfortunately at the same place at the same time and the usual result occurred. TWA lost half a wing and through some highly skillful heroics on the part of its pilot, landed successfully; and Eastern landed in a wooded area, fortunately, and unfortunately some people did not get out of it.

One of the airplanes apparently, and I do not attempt to evaluate the accident report which is on file, was not at the right altitude, and it is possible to say that no controller can be held responsible for that as long as the tape shows that he achieved with his instructions the desired separation. But is this really the answer? I think it is not.

The controller relies today exclusively on what the pilot tells him as to its altitude and then he must remember it and when he sees two targets cross, he must rely on his memory that they are separated vertically, although not horizontally.

We have had pilots, and we know about it, reporting 10,000 feet off their attitude by misreading altimeters. The controller usually is helpless to disagree with that or check the error, but if our controller back during that accident had had the equipment that he could now have, if somebody had put it in, he would have seen, no matter what the pilot thought he heard, that two airplanes both indicating on the scope the same altitude were about to have an unhappy encounter and could have prevented that.

I think that every accident of that size that can be prevented—or even two Piper cubs—is worth whatever investment is necessary. I realize that the War in Vietnam is important and that we must contribute substantial funds for it, but as long as the people who run the country are among the 10 per cent who fly, and so long as American citizens are given some sort of assurance that when they enter an airplane and feel it leave the runway they know it will get back down safely, there is no excuse whatsoever for going second best in the business of air traffic control.

The equipment now used is second best. The controllers coming in to replace the ones who have formed this Organization are second best, and that is the way we are pointed at the moment. If any of you should see in the future that the Controllers have said not only to authorities but also publicly, "This airport will not have more than X landings per hour period", you will know that at least the message was laid down this evening here in New York. That will not be an effort to demonstrate. It is an undesirable result for everybody. It is not in some areas very far away.

It is the responsibility and the duty of every controller to stop before we have gone too far and he will do so.

If someone directs him to accept five more airplanes per hour than he says he can handle, and that is his decision alone, just as the pilot holds the decision as to what speed he will use over the fence or on climb out, then the name of the man will be properly emblazoned, and whether or not the order is followed if a crash occurs, that name will be reported infamously in history.

I rather think that however powerful superior representatives of agencies or other areas from whence directives come may be, it is unlikely that that order will ever be given, whether or not it may be obeyed.

We hope very much because being good fellows and realistic Americans, we will, of

course, reopen the bar immediately after this short meeting is over, that we hear from everybody that is interested in air traffic control and I know that you would not be here unless you were.

We will make available to all of you the first issue without even your having to ask for the copy of our Journal. We hope, and it must go to press within thirty days, because it is the vehicle by means of which we will initially inform all of these people in outlying areas that we cannot directly visit what this organization is, what its aims are and what its limits are and the nature of its professional level.

We hope that you will look through it, and we also hope to have by then the ideas of the aviation industry, the professional pilots, the general aviation, the Air Transport Association, indeed everyone who has any concern with this, and especially those in the Congress who must shoulder the ultimate responsibility of deciding what will be done to remedy a situation that is in trouble now.

At any time I hope that any of you will ask for meetings, discussions—we can dig committees out of the Air Traffic Controllers that you never heard of. As I said, they are resilient, they have shown me—because they have exhausted me in the process—working twenty-eight hours a day, that means that they are sleeping coming up with an idea. But this is an immediate thing; it isn't an idea for a future great society of Air Traffic Controllers; it is intended to be a steam-roller and will remedy a situation that threatens to crop up faster than it can be handled. To the extent that their responsibility is involved, they have assumed it and they will implement it. If I may borrow a term that I hate from Governmental Memoranda: They need your help in doing so just as you need theirs.

When the time comes to put a bill into the Congress we will furnish evidence describing the form of testimony that I have told you tonight. I am very hopeful that most of you who are professionally involved in aviation from any avenue are in agreement, because somebody is going to call upon you to support or contradict that testimony.

There isn't a man here who doesn't owe his life at one time or another to an Air Traffic Controller, and we hope when the time comes you will remember that fact and not let them down.

The best assurance you have in addition to the superiority of your machinery and the skills upon which you rely is the direction which you receive at a time when your vision is limited to about three feet; that is the distance between the pilot and the instrument panel.

We want to thank you all very much for coming.

PFC. JEFFREY SEGAL, U.S. ARMY,
KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report that one of my constituents, Pfc. Jeffrey B. Segal, U.S. Army, of Carmel, N.Y., died last month in Vietnam.

I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by inserting herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, the following article from the White Plains, N.Y., Reporter Dispatch, May 31, 1968:

PFC. JEFFREY SEGAL IS KILLED IN VIETNAM

CARMEL.—A Carmel High School senior, Mrs. Theresa A. Segal, 53 Glenelda Ave., has been notified by the Department of the

Army that the soldier she married last November was killed in action in Vietnam on May 21.

While attending school in Carmel the 18-year-old girl has been residing with her mother, Mrs. Ralph Balzano.

Pfc. Jeffrey B. Segal, 20, Co. "C," 1st Bn, 6th Inf., Americal Division, fell before enemy machine gun fire during action in the Central area of the Vietnamese Republic according to the Army authorities. Notification to the widow, and to the soldier's mother, Mrs. William J. Murphy, a summer resident at Lake Carmel was made Saturday evening by Capt. Richard Clarke of the U.S. Army Garrison at West Point.

The soldier's military records indicate he graduated from DeWitt Clinton High School in New York, that he was inducted into the service from New York City and that his father is deceased.

Pending arrival of the soldier's remains in this country, members of the family are planning funeral services in the city; a memorial service at St. James the Apostle R.C. Church in Carmel with interment at St. Lawrence O'Toole Cemetery in Brewster.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY BILL

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent event which—if it was not so tragedy laden—would be comical. As it stands, it is a matter of the greatest irony, especially as the House of Representatives will shortly be considering a weakened and watered-down version of the natural gas pipeline safety bill.

Last weekend I was shocked to pick up the newspapers and read that at the recent annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Gas Association, the Equitable Gas Co. of Pittsburgh received an industry safety award only a few months after five of its employees were killed in a natural gas explosion and shortly after it was named as a defendant in a \$1.5 million suit arising from another fatal gas explosion last November.

This award to the Equitable Gas Co. for "achieving an outstanding on-the-job safety record" shows that the natural gas industry does not know what constitutes safety and that it feels that deaths, in small numbers, are an acceptable byproduct of their industry.

It is certainly ironic after five members of an Equitable Gas crew were fatally injured in a January 1968 blast at Ingram, a Pittsburgh suburb, and after the loss of life in another explosion in Washington County last November, that the company could be praised by the Pennsylvania Gas Association for being one of the six safest natural gas companies in the State.

If this is considered to be a safety-conscious company by the gas industry then the industry is admitting it has a very poor concept of what the word means. This points out why the House of Representatives must not buckle under to the strong and subtle industry lobby which has succeeded in diluting the natural gas pipeline safety bill in the House.

We must band together and make every effort to strengthen it by amendments on the floor.

The original pipeline safety bill as passed by the Senate was an excellent piece of legislation. It had the approval of the President, the Secretary of Transportation, and Miss Betty Furness, the President's adviser on consumer problems. The bill as reported out by the House committee was so weakened by the natural gas industry special interest lobbyists that it no longer has the approval of the administration.

I hope all my colleagues will band together when the bill does come up so that we can strengthen and return it to its original respectable form.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA SCOTTISH HIGHLANDERS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the University of Iowa Scottish Highlanders have long been a part of the campus scene at Iowa City. They have performed before thousands of people at football games, on trips in this country and abroad.

Recently they centered the competition at the Kansas Highland Festival and did very well.

The student newspaper at the University of Iowa, the Daily Iowan, tells about the Highlanders' accomplishments at Kansas City:

HIGHLANDERS MARCH AWAY WITH HONORS AT FESTIVAL

The University Scottish Highlanders marched away with a number of honors at the Kansas City Highland Festival, it was announced Tuesday by Al McIvor, director of the all-girl bagpipe band.

Forty-two members of the band competed in the Highland Games held May 18 and 19 in Kansas City. Pipe bands from throughout the U.S. and Canada and more than 10,000 spectators attended the event.

Honors went to Barbara Brewer, A4, Clarinda, who placed first in drum major competition, and Bonnie Luzius, A3, Fairview Park, Ohio, who received a first, a second and two third places in dancing competition. Miss Luzius competed with a sprained ankle.

The group also fielded an eight-member miniature band which received a rank of 7 out of 10 competing units, McIvor said. This was the first time the coeds had ever marched in miniature band form.

The Highlanders were the only girls to enter competition. Miss Brewer, who has led the group for four years, found her reception in the drum major competition rather cool. "I was the only girl in the seven contestants," she remarked, adding that "one man asked me if I was really going through with it and another told me that if I was really going to compete I better 'strengthen my bloody bonnet'."

"The men were all very military-like," she recalls, "and didn't even smile. They put me in the middle of the line so the judges couldn't see me." But Miss Brewer had the last laugh.

Members of the miniature band were pipers Cynthia MacLaren, A2, Hickman, Ky.; Cynthia Waddell, A1, Marysville, Mich.; Terry Seaton, A3, Seaton, Ill.; Margo Lawson, A2, Raleigh, N.C.; and Pam Klocksiem, A4, Rock-

well City. The two snare drummers were Marcia Nice, A3, Sterling, Ill. and Mary Murphy, A1, Ida Grove, Karen Rummells, A3, West Branch was bass drummer.

The Kansas City Highland Games were sponsored by the St. Andrew Society, an international Scottish organization.

COURTS OF CHANGE AND REVOLUTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the rulings of the Federal courts in recent weeks would indicate not only that the judges can not read the law or Constitution but that they do not even know what they are doing—a theoretical jurisprudence without any direction.

Who ever heard of judges striking down "freedom of choice" because someone failed to exercise his freedom? Can freedom be made mandatory and still be freedom? Sounds like Castro's voluntary slave labor cane cutters.

Landlords lose control of their own property if an eviction is charged as retaliatory.

And State courts must tax their people with the additional expense of jury trials in misdemeanor cases if, as the judges feel, "a possible penalty is a serious crime?"

What constitutional laws or concepts could have expelled this imagination.

But Mr. Warren and his Ivory-tower circle—possibly oblivious to the crime and revolution about us—take no action for law and order to retain sanity.

We can but deduce they know what they are doing and desire more violence and chaos in our land.

If the tenants have a free hand against retaliatory landlords—then free people must react against retaliatory judges.

And now the murdered victim is to be refused a fair trial by the State, being forced to accept objectors to the death penalty on the jury. The law is being eroded backward to where the individual need mete out justice or justice is denied.

How much longer do they think the American public will allow unelected judges to free the guilty and punish the innocent—judges in solemn black robes executing civilization.

I include news articles from the Evening Star for May 27 and May 29, 1968, the Times-Picayune of New Orleans for May 25, and the Evening Star for May 18 and 19, and June 3, 1968, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 27, 1968]

SUPREME COURT CURBS FREE-CHOICE SCHOOLS

The Supreme Court held today that so-called "freedom of choice" school plans are inadequate methods for desegregation where another reasonably available means will accomplish it more effectively.

Although the tribunal stopped short of prohibiting such plans altogether, the decision set out a new, stepped-up command for effective public school desegregation efforts in Southern states.

"The burden on a school board today is to come forward with a plan that promises realistically to work and promises realistic-

ly to work now," Justice William J. Brennan Jr. said in the unanimous opinion.

"Although the general experience under 'freedom of choice' to date has been such as to indicate its ineffectiveness as a tool of desegregation, there may well be instances in which it can serve as an effective device," Brennan said.

"On the other hand," he said, "if there are reasonably available other ways, such for illustration as zoning, promising speedier conversion to a unitary, nonracial school system, 'freedom of choice' must be held unacceptable."

The new school desegregation guideline, announced 14 years after the high court's historic 1954 school decision, was set forth in a packet of opinions in cases from New Kent County, Va.; Gould, Ark., and Jackson, Tenn.

In New Kent County, a rural area in eastern Virginia, one of the only two schools still is all Negro. The other has 519 white pupils and 115 Negroes.

"In other words, the school system remains a dual system," Brennan said.

Brennan said school officials must try a more effective method.

He said that drawing a line across a county, assigning pupils on one side of the county to one school and those on the other side of the county to the other facility, would achieve a "unitary, nonracial system... with a minimum of administrative difficulty."

The school board's obligation, Brennan said, is to formulate a new plan which promises realistically "to convert promptly to a system without a 'white' school and a 'Negro' school, but just schools."

In Gould, Ark., 304 white and 71 Negro students attend one school complex under a "freedom of choice" plan while all the rest of the county's Negro students attend a second, all Negro complex.

Brennan, in this decision, also called for development of some other plan, such as a zoning approach, to promptly achieve a unitary, nonracial system.

The Jackson, Tenn., case dealt with a "free transfer" school plan that the high court held operated like the two "freedom of choice" plans and was inadequate as a desegregation tool.

Brennan did not indicate what degree of integration would satisfy the court's new desegregation requirement.

In the New Kent County and Gould rulings, however, the facts of the cases made it clear that an acceptable plan must do more than move a comparatively small percentage of Negro students to a formerly all white school, while still leaving their former school all Negro.

The approach taken by the justices today is substantially what they were asked to do two months ago by the Justice Department and the NAACP legal defense fund during oral arguments in the three cases.

Both groups stopped short of condemning "freedom of choice" plans outright, but urged that school boards be placed under a duty to fashion plans that would effectively bring about an end to racially identifiable schools.

Today's decision will require a reassessment in many Southern localities that have included "freedom of choice" plans to insure continued federal school aid.

The court announced these other actions today:

INDIANS

The right of Indians to avoid state game laws under old treaty provisions was upheld in one case, while in another the court declared that state conservation laws should apply to Indians along with other state citizens.

In the first case, the court affirmed 6-2 a Court of Claims decision that the Menominee Tribe in Wisconsin continues to have termination of an 1854 treaty. The court denied the Indians' claims they said were unlimited hunting and fishing rights despite

In the other case, involving two other tribes, Justice William O. Douglas wrote a 9-0 opinion holding that the Indians' right to fish is subject to Wisconsin conservation laws "reasonable and necessary for the preservation of the fishery."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 29, 1968]

MADDOX LOWERS FLAG IN PROTEST

ATLANTA.—Gov. Lester Maddox draped the U.S. Constitution in black and lowered flags to half-staff yesterday to protest the U.S. Supreme Court's latest school desegregation ruling.

"This is another attack by the U.S. Supreme Court that is bringing violence, death, communism and the welfare state that is destroying our country," Maddox said in an irate speech in front of a flagpole on the lawn of the state capitol.

The Supreme Court on Monday curbed the use of freedom-of-choice desegregation plans that are widely used in the South.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, May 25, 1968]

ANY REASON WHY ATTORNEY GENERAL CAN'T AVOID COURT TIEUP?

The U.S. Supreme Court last Monday remanded to Louisiana a "simple battery" case with the stipulation that it must be tried by jury (rather than by a judge, as this was) because an offense carrying a possible penalty of two years in jail was a "serious crime" and not a "petty offense."

Attorney General Jack P. F. Gremillion averred that the decision would slow the criminal courts of the state "to a standstill." We believe he is largely correct—unless prompt legislative action is taken to relieve the condition. Some of the work of the courts would continue since some small percentage of these cases provide for relative small penalties of less than six months or a year. Some few defendants who have the option of a jury trial might waive it. But since most so-called "misdemeanor" cases call for sentences with maximums of a year or more, the criminal courts processes certainly would be largely paralyzed. Obviously that would be a tragic state of affairs, especially in this time of an upsurging crime incidence.

But we believe that Attorney General Gremillion, with the cooperation of the Legislature, now in meeting, can avert the courts tie-up. His office would have to work with diligence and haste, but what is wrong with these in an emergency situation?

After reading the full court decision, it strikes us that the following course offers a way out:

1. Make minor revisions in about 50 sections of the criminal code to reduce the maximum jail sentences for misdemeanors to six months, or at any rate, less than a year.

2. Rewrite the five-man jury article (for felonies not necessarily punishable at hard labor) to require that misdemeanor cases where the penalty is more than six months shall be tried by such a jury. (That would seem to meet requirements in the few types of serious misdemeanors for which it was desirable to retain maximum sentence of more than the six months.)

We believe the attorney general should, after studying the decision text, consider the practicability of such a course of simple rewriting.

The taxpayers should not be called on to stand the expense of a special legislative session to adjust the criminal code, if that can be done by prompt action now.

The bills should be presented by Tuesday night's deadline for introductions. If they cannot be presented by that time, they can be admitted a little later with the consent of a two-thirds vote of each house of the Legislature.

Without drawing any clear border between serious and petty crimes, the court said that

any offense subject to a maximum penalty of two years in jail was a jury case under the requirements of the Constitution. It prescribed no firm guidelines but did comment "that there appear only two instances, aside from the Louisiana scheme, in which the state denies jury trial for a crime punishable by imprisonment for longer than six months." It added that the federal maximum for nonjury trial is six months. The court did not frown on the use of the five-man jury as Louisiana uses it, though it did mention that only two states employed it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 18, 1968]

RETALIATORY EVICTIONS ILLEGAL, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS SAYS

(By William Basham)

The U.S. Court of Appeals, in a split decision yesterday, forbade retaliatory evictions of tenants who report housing code violations.

Sidestepping constitutional issues, the majority held that the tenant's right to complain of housing violations without fear of eviction is implied in the District's housing codes. The court ordered a new trial for a woman who was not allowed to try to prove in a lower court that her eviction stemmed from her housing complaints.

The opinion, a major decision in landlord-tenant relations, said that "while the landlord may evict for any legal reason or for no reason at all, he is not, we hold, free to evict in retaliation for his tenant's report of housing code violations to the authorities."

"As a matter of statutory construction and for reasons of public policy, such an eviction cannot be permitted."

The ruling was written by Judge J. Skelly Wright, with Judge Carl McGowan concurring in part. Judge John A. Danaher dissented.

DECISION HAILED

Many low-income tenants have complained that they face retaliatory evictions if they report housing code violations to the District government. A spokesman for the Neighborhood Legal Service Project, hailing the decision, said tenants evicted after complaining to the housing office can now press this argument in court.

The case decided by the court began three years ago when Mrs. Yvonne Edwards claimed that her lease on a rented home at 770 Irving St. NW was terminated by her landlord because she reported housing violations on the property to the District's Department of Licenses and Inspections.

In the lower courts, Mrs. Edwards was not given the right to introduce evidence to try to show that her landlord, Nathan Habib, was retaliating. The lower courts held that under the housing code, Habib did not have to give a reason for eviction under the 30-day rental agreement.

Her attorney, Brian M. Olmstead of the Neighborhood Legal Services Project, argued that retaliatory evictions violate a tenant's 1st Amendment right to petition his government. But the appeals court said it did not have to address itself to that question.

RIGHT APPLIED

The appellate court wrote that Congress did not intend the right to petition to be stifled when it approved the District's housing codes. The court said the right was implied, and ordered a new trial for Mrs. Edwards in the Court of General Sessions with instructions to permit evidence on the question of whether the eviction was retaliatory.

Wright further commented: "In light of the appalling condition and shortage of housing in Washington, the expense of moving, the inequality of bargaining power between tenant and landlord and the social and economic importance of assuring at least minimum standards in housing conditions, we do not hesitate to declare that retaliatory evictions cannot be tolerated."

In his dissent, Judge Danaher condemned practices such as retaliatory evictions, but said that the majority went too far in outlining the court's power over a landlord's property.

Danaher said that if legal standards bearing on this type of complaint are too vague, Congress, rather than the courts, should provide legislation to correct the problem.

He cited a message to Congress last March by President Johnson, who recommended legislation "to prevent retaliatory evictions by landlords in the District."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, May 19, 1968]

ABA TO GET PLEA TO BACK HIGH COURT

The American Bar Association's Board of Governors will be asked this week to go to bat against proposed congressional restrictions on the Supreme Court.

The 21-man executive group is to meet here tomorrow, the day before the Senate is scheduled to vote on a five-part section of the Johnson administration's crime bill that would cut into the courts effort to extend constitutional rights.

Over the years the ABA has opposed attempts to limit jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The controversial section, chiefly the work of Sens. John L. McClellan, D-Ark., and Sam J. Ervin, D-N.C., represents the most serious effort in years to cut down the court and roll back its decisions.

Last month, ABA President Earl Morris wrote Senate Democratic leader Mike Mansfield and the members of the judiciary committee that the council of the ABA's section on criminal law had decided to oppose the proposed amendments and to ask the board of governors to go along.

The amendments, in the main, would take away the Supreme Court's authority to upset confessions accepted as valid by state courts, abolish federal habeas corpus jurisdiction over local criminal convictions and reverse Supreme Court decisions limiting use of confessions and police lineup identifications.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 3, 1968]

JUSTICES STRIKE DOWN "HANGING JURY" SYSTEMS—HIGH COURT ALSO GIVES SOME IMMUNITY TO TEACHERS WHO CRITICIZE OFFICIALS

(By Dana Bullen)

The Supreme Court ruled today that the death penalty may not be imposed by juries that exclude persons possessing general objections or religious scruples against capital punishment.

"Whatever else might be said of capital punishment, it is at least clear that its imposition by a 'hanging jury' cannot be squared by the Constitution," Justice Potter Stewart said in an opinion for the court.

The opinion overturned the conviction and death penalty of a man convicted in the 1960 slaying of a Chicago, Ill. policeman. Three justices dissented.

In a second decision on a separate subject, the court held today that teachers in public schools have a limited immunity from discharge for making public statements critical of school authorities or their activities.

This ruling, delivered by Justice Thurgood Marshall, overturned an Illinois Supreme Court decision upholding the dismissal of a Lockport, Ill., teacher who wrote a letter to a newspaper accusing school officials of putting athletics and field equipment ahead of teachers' salaries and academic excellence.

A NARROW ISSUE

The opinion in the death penalty case leaves room for states to exclude persons with a fixed view against capital punishment.

It also did not deal with possible challenges of jurors who state that reservations about the death penalty would prevent them

from deciding impartially the issue of guilt or innocence.

The narrower question decided by the justices thus represents only a limited inroad on the death penalty rather than a broad scale attack on capital punishment or the methods by which it is imposed.

Stewart said in the majority opinion that data before the court was too tentative and fragmentary to show that jurors not opposed to the death penalty tend to favor the prosecution in the determination of guilt.

Despite this, Stewart said, the practice followed in the Chicago case of William C. Witherspoon "fell woefully short" of the impartially guaranteed defendants in criminal cases by the Constitution.

At the time of Witherspoon's trial in Chicago, state law provided that jurors could be removed if they said they had "conscientious scruples against capital punishment, or that (they are) opposed to the same."

In this way, Stewart said, the prosecution was afforded unlimited opportunity to exclude jurors who "might hesitate" to return a verdict of death.

In Witherspoon's case, nearly half of the prospective jurors were stricken for this reason. The jury that was finally empaneled convicted Witherspoon and sentenced him to death.

"In a nation less than half of whose people believe in the death penalty, Stewart said, a jury composed exclusively of such people cannot speak for the community."

"Culled of all who harbor doubts about the wisdom of capital punishment—of all who would be reluctant to pronounce the extreme penalty—such a jury can speak only for a distinct and dwindling minority," he said.

"In its quest for a jury capable of imposing the death penalty, the state produced uncommonly willing to condemn a man to die."

In a dissenting opinion, Justices Hugo L. Black, John Marshall Harlan and Byron R. White flatly rejected Stewart's contention that the Illinois practice had "stacked the deck" against Witherspoon.

"With all due deference, it seems to me that one might much more appropriately charge that this court has today written the law in such a way that the states are being forced to try their murder cases with biased juries," Black said.

"If this court is to hold capital punishment unconstitutional I think it should do so forthrightly, not by making it impossible for states to get juries that will enforce the death penalty," he said.

THE TEACHER CASE

In the decision in the Illinois teacher discharge case, Marshall indicated that there could be situations in which discharge of a teacher for statements critical of school officials might be justified.

"The problem in any case is to arrive at a balance between the interests of the teacher as a citizen, in commenting upon matters of public concern, and the interest of the state as an employer in promoting the efficiency of the public services it performs through its employees," Marshall said.

The opinion—from which White dissented in part—said "it is essential" that teachers be able to speak out freely on matters of public interest without fear of retaliatory dismissal.

In the Lockport case, the court said that the teacher involved, Marvin L. Pickering, had a sufficiently distant working relationship with the school officials be criticized so as to permit him to speak without interfering with the relationship.

In a closer working relationship, or under other circumstances involving possible impairment of school operations, Marshall indicated, a teacher's right to speak out might be less broad.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following report to my constituents:

MEMO

FEDERAL SPENDING . . . Those of us who have urged restraint in government spending recognize that it is not the instant road to popularity. The easy way is to spend government money freely; then nobody has to be told that they can't have the federal funds they've been waiting for—for a sewer, a hospital, a loan, a grant, or what have you. The hard way is to vote to keep spending within reasonable bounds—which means that everybody cannot have everything they want all at the same time. The easy way—the way which seems to please the most people—is unfortunately the one which eventually hurts the most people. This is not to say that there are not government needs which must be met; there are and the meeting of them is a costly business which can be accomplished only with a sound, stable and productive economy. The ultimate result of federal spending without regard to the deficits created is to so weaken the economy that either drastic steps must be taken to cure its ills or it collapses into disaster.

COST . . . Furthermore, any responsible congressman, in voting on spending measures, ought to keep in mind that he is not spending his own money, that the government can only give away what it first takes in through taxes from its citizens and that taxes, no matter how devised, come largely out of the hide of John Q. Average Citizen. The price of big spending is big taxes, cutting heavily into take-home pay. When the big spending outraces big taxes to produce big deficits, the price is even higher. It is called "inflation" a fancy word for "I don't know what happened to last week's pay check."

INFLATION . . . Inflation is here—now. It is here simply because the Administration in power—for the last eight years—has pursued a policy of trying to please everybody while spending the nation billions of dollars into debt each year. (You name it; there's a federal program to start it, stop it, speed it or spread it.) As a result, prices are already going up at a rate of over 4 percent a year. People are paying 7-8 percent in our area for home mortgages—when they can find a lender. In the inflation now going on, and in that to come, everyone will suffer from a squeeze on their incomes. The poor will suffer the most because they must spend the biggest percentage of their incomes on pure necessities. The price of the big spending spree will be paid by everyone—first, in high prices for everything, and second in high taxes (paid directly or passed on).

WHAT FOLLOWS . . . But this is not all. Inflation spirals, feeds upon itself, as wages go up to match price increases which go up because of wage increases, etc., etc. The danger is something even worse than high prices; the danger is economic collapse. To quote an economist (See *Memo*, 4/30/68). "There is a danger of a recession caused by a tardy and unduly severe application of the brakes; or, in the absence of adequate restraint, there is a danger that the inflation will accelerate, in which case it will be followed by a recession from natural causes." A recession, of either type, coming on top of our international monetary difficulties and gold loss, could spell disaster.

POSITION . . . Exorbitant federal spending, in the long run, harms even those who think they benefit from it the most. It endangers the welfare of every citizen, weakens our

economy and threatens the future of the nation by bringing on the evils and consequences of inflation. That's why I opposed the kind of spending which created the situation confronting us right now. It is why I have insisted that any tax increase must be accompanied by a sizeable spending cut.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART
CALENDAR FOR JUNE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the month of June as more sightseers come to Washington, D.C., to see the beauty of our Nation's Capitol, it is known that the National Gallery can be a restful and exciting visit. Therefore, I call to the attention of my colleagues and the American people the schedule of events for the month of June at the National Gallery of Art:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART—CALENDAR OF
EVENTS, JUNE 1968

Special exhibition: *Paintings from the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo, New York*, continues on view through July 21 in the ground floor galleries. A catalogue for the exhibition is available with 21 color plates and 121 black and white illustrations. \$4.00 postpaid.

Concerts: The 25th annual American Music Festival directed by Richard Bales concludes on June 2 with a performance of his composition *The Republic* by the National Gallery Orchestra with chorus and soloists. Also ending, for the summer, is the current season of weekly concerts, with a final performance on Sunday, June 30. All concerts begin at 8 p.m. in the East Garden Court.

Daily films: *The National Gallery of Art* (52 min.): Weekdays, 2:00 p.m., Sundays, 1:00 p.m. *The American Vision* (35 min.): Weekdays, 4:00 p.m. *Art in the Western World* (30 min.): Weekdays, 7:00 p.m. Each film is in full color and deals with art in the collections of the National Gallery. Auditorium.

Recorded tours: *The Director's Tour*. A 45-minute tour of 20 National Gallery masterpieces selected and described by John Walker, Director. The portable tape units rent for 25¢ for one person, 35¢ for two. Available in English, French, Spanish, and German.

Tour of Selected Galleries. A discussion of works of art in 28 galleries. Talks in each room, which may be taken in any order, last approximately 15 minutes. The small radio receiving sets rent for 25¢.

New color postcards: Blake, *The Great Red Dragon and the Woman Clothed with the Sun*; Chase, *Chrysanthemums*; Courbet, *La Grotte de la Loue*; Duccio, *Nativity with the Prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel*; Homer, *Right and Left*; Kalf, *Still Life*; Ryder, *Siegfried and the Rhine Maidens*; Stubbs, *Colonel Pocklington with His Sisters*; Circle of Verrocchio (possibly Leonardo), *Madonna and Child with a Pomegranate*. 5¢ each postpaid.

Gallery hours: Weekdays, 10:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Sundays, 12 noon to 10:00 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all scheduled exhibitions and programs.

Cafeteria hours: Weekdays, Luncheon 11:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.; Snack Service 2:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.; Dinner 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Sundays, Dinner 12 noon to 7:30 p.m.

MONDAY, MAY 27, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 2

Painting of the week: Master of the Saint Bartholomew Altar. *The Baptism of Christ*

(Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 35A, Tues., Wed., Fri., and Sat. 12 and 2; Sun. 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: *20th-Century European Paintings from Albright-Knox* (to be repeated June 25-30), central gallery, Tues., Wed., Fri. and Sat. 1; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11 and 3; Thurs. (Memorial Day) 1; Sun. 5.

Sunday lecture: *Surrealism, Belgian Fantastic Art, Homage to René Magritte*. Guest Speaker: Marcel van Jole, Professor of Aesthetics, Antwerp, Belgium, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: 25th American Music Festival: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, Conductor, with Chorus and Soloists. East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, JUNE 3, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 9

Painting of the week: Franco-Flemish School, Early XV Century. *Profile Portrait of a Lady* (Andrew Mellon Collection), Gallery 39, Tues. through Sat. 12 and 2; Sun. 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: *20th-Century American Paintings from Albright-Knox* (to be repeated June 18-23), Central Gallery, Tues. through Sat. 1; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11 and 3; Sun. 5.

Sunday lecture: *Folk Elements in Contemporary Realist and Non-Objective Art*. Guest Speaker: Paul M. Laporte, Professor of Art History, Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles. Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: William Brown, Tenor; Reynaldo Reyes, Pianist. East Garden Court 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office or telephoned to 737-4215, ext. 272.

MONDAY, JUNE 10, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 16

Painting of the week: Ingres. *Madame Moitessier* (Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 56, Tues. through Sat. 12 and 2; Sun. 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: *19th-Century French Paintings from Albright-Knox* (repeated from May 21-26), Central Gallery, Tues. through Sat. 1; Sun. 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11 and 3; Sun. 5.

Sunday lecture: *Light in Painting*. Guest Speaker: René Huyghe, Kress Professor in Residence, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: Zaidée Dufallo, Pianist. East Garden Court, 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery Staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, JUNE 17, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 23

Painting of the week: Rembrandt. *Portrait of a Lady with an Ostrich-Feather Fan* (Widener Collection), Gallery 45, Tues. through Sat. 12 and 2; Sun. 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: *20th-Century American Paintings from Albright-Knox* (repeated from June 4-9), Central Gallery, Tues. through Sat. 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rotunda, Mon. through Sat. 11 and 3; Sun. 5.

Sunday lecture: *Botticelli, Leonardo, and the Arts of Frustration*. Speaker: Raymond S. Stites, Assistant to the Director, for Educational Services, National Gallery of Art, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: To be announced. East Garden Court, 8.

MONDAY, JUNE 24, THROUGH SUNDAY, JUNE 30

Painting of the week: Florentine School. *Apollo and Marsyas* (Samuel H. Kress Collection), Gallery 13; Tues. through Sat. 12 and 2; Sun. 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: *20th-Century European Paintings from Albright-Knox* (repeated

from May 28-June 2); Central Gallery, Tues. through Sat. 1; Sun. 2.30.

Tour: *Introduction to the Collection*. Rounda, Mon. through Sat. 11 and 3; Sun. 5.

Sunday lecture: *The Baroque Aspects of the Film*. Guest Speaker: Bernard Hanson, Director, Liberal Arts Department, Philadelphia College of Art, Philadelphia. Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: To be announced. East Garden Court 8.

L. B. J. RANKS HIGH AS CONSERVATIONIST

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Kansas City Star of Sunday, April 21, 1968, praising the labors and efforts of President Lyndon Baines Johnson as a conservationist.

Americans in this and coming generations will have great reason to thank our distinguished President for his splendid efforts to make this a better and a more viable Nation in which to live through preservation of our natural resources.

The editorial follows:

L. B. J. RANKS HIGH AS CONSERVATIONIST

Lyndon B. Johnson's roots go deep into the soil of Texas. He has always loved the land and gained strength from it. Therefore, it is not surprising that his White House years have been studded with major accomplishments in the field of conservation.

Many far-reaching programs have been advanced by the President and most of them have been written into law. Among the high points are the Land and Water Conservation fund, the Highway Beautification act, the Wilderness act, the Wild River bill and the proposal for a Redwood National park.

All of these programs are designed to improve the American environment and to preserve a larger portion of this continent for future generations to enjoy. In order to gain increased public support for his proposals, the President called the White House Conference on Natural Beauty in May of 1965.

At the conclusion, he assembled the delegates in the East Room of the White House and read them a special message, detailing some of his ambitious plans. It was an historic document.

When he had finished, the President laid aside his text and began to speak informally. His words were a moving tribute to the land and what it meant to him.

"I remember," he began, "when I was a very young man, a boy who walked through the sand—hot sand—up to see my grandfather—a child of 5 or 6. I would cross the dusty field and walk along the banks of the river . . .

"And those hills, and those fields, that river was the only world that I really had in those years. So I did not know how much more beautiful it was than that of many other boys, for I could not imagine anything else from sky to sky. Yet the sight and the feel of that country somehow or other burned itself into my mind.

"We were not a wealthy family, but this was my rich inheritance. All my life I have drawn strength, and something more, from those Texas hills. Sometimes, in the highest councils of the nation, in this house, I sit back and I can almost feel that rough, unyielding, sticky clay soil between my fingers

and it stirs memories that often give me comfort and sometimes gives me a pretty firm purpose.

"But not all the boys in America had the privilege to grow up in a wide and open country. We can give them something and we are going to.

"We can let each of them feel a little of what the first settlers must have felt, unbelieving before the endless majesty of our great land. Thus, they too, will reach for the wonders of our future, reinforced by the treasured values of our past."

That rare insight, probably better than anything else, explains Lyndon Johnson's dream for a more beautiful America.

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT OF THE SUPREME COURT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the omnibus crime control bill is on your desk and I must say that it is a matter of great concern to me that the bill as it came back from the Senate is very different from the good bill that passed this House. A most perceptive article was written by Mr. Herbert Mitgang of the editorial board of the New York Times. It appeared in the Monday Times, May 27, 1968, and most persuasively presents the dangers to our country and our traditional concepts of justice if this bill passes in its present form. The article referred to follows:

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT OF THE SUPREME COURT

(By Herbert Mitgang)

The clashing elements in Congress and warring philosophies of government have emerged in classic form during the consideration of the administration's omnibus crime control bill. The bill's evolution serves as a case history of evolving views on the relationship of the cities to the Federal Government and of political alliances to preserve rigid state authority. It also provides a measure of the contrasting attitudes toward the rebellious mood in the country.

As originally conceived, this bill was designed to assist state and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime and increasing the effectiveness and fairness of law enforcement and criminal justice. There was proper concern for the safety of persons in the neighborhoods and in homes during a time of rising crime. But in the background, there was an awareness of the dangers of unchecked rioting.

DIRECT GRANTS TO CITIES

The Administration-supported bill was approved almost intact by the House last year. Its main provision included grants—\$100 million the first year, \$300 million the second—by the United States Attorney General to states and cities for improving anti-crime programs and police departments. The point was that, since law enforcement is primarily a local responsibility, direct grants to the cities would bypass state machinery and strike at the core of the crime problem.

MORE ORDER THAN LAW

When the bill reached the Senate, three controversial titles were added that reflected tougher views on order and weaker views on law. Furthermore, political considerations became apparent that mauled the original aims of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe

Streets Act, even though some useful provisions were approved.

The grants to local communities—Title I—must now go for the most part through the state houses. In the opinion of the Attorney General and many city law-enforcement agencies, such bloc grants would inevitably be a step removed from where the real action is. The concept of Federal grants is still retained, but the funds may not be used to best advantage in some states where political differences exist between governors and mayors.

On eavesdropping and wiretapping—Title III—the Senate bill goes a long way toward encouraging governmental invasion of privacy. Snooping for a wide variety of comparatively minor crimes is authorized. Most shocking is the fact that Federal, state and local law enforcement agencies would be permitted to engage in these practices, for brief periods without even a court order. Taps and bugs could become standard procedure for any low level prosecutor. If anything is the hallmark of a police state, it is the citizen's inability to speak freely at home, in the office and even in the street.

RIFLE LOBBY VICTORY

When it came to controlling interstate shipment of firearms—Title IV—the Senate banned the mail order sales of hand guns. This must be considered a partial victory for law enforcement. But long guns—rifles and shotguns—were omitted, a total victory for the rifle lobby.

The most complex and controversial Senate amendment—Title II—is a deliberate attempt to undermine the decisions of the United States Supreme Court. All voluntary confessions and eyewitness identifications—regardless of whether a suspect has been informed of his rights to counsel—would be admitted in Federal trials. Evidence could be admitted even if there was unreasonable delay between the time of arrest and arraignment.

TARGET: THE WARREN COURT

This title does more than strike at Constitutional safeguards of due process. The target here is really the Warren court, which has had the audacity to defend the Bill of Rights. In a larger sense, it is an attack on the system of checks and balances. When the House and Senate get together on the final version of the bill, the titles on the authority of the Supreme Court and on the invasion of privacy will demand changes that preserve the judicial branch.

"There is no liberty if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers," Montesquieu wrote in "The Spirit of the Laws" before our constitution. And it was underscored by Alexander Hamilton in "The Federalist," when he wrote that checks and balances "can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of courts of justice."

SO FULL A FLOOD

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the consideration of my colleagues and for the readers of the RECORD "So Full a Flood." This statement, which I feel is very appropriate to our time, is being distributed by the Fathers of the Oratory, Post Office Box 1326, Lexington, Ky., 40501, and I have obtained their permission, through Father Francis E. Nugent, superior, to in-

clude this copyrighted material in the RECORD:

SO FULL A FLOOD

Shall we ever see again so full a flood of hypocrisy as that in which the land has lain awash in the last weeks?

As the savages made funeral pyres out of parts of a hundred cities, a craven clergy dutifully responded to the latest rubrics handed down from The Great Birdcage, D.C., and eulogized the deceased as though he had been Saint Stephen just done in by the Jews.

They called him a great Christian, he who denied the Divinity of Christ and His Virgin Birth.

They called him a man of honour, he who Mr. J. Edgar Hoover described as "the most notorious liar in the country."

They called him a great patriot, he who was a notorious collaborator with known Communists and a preacher of revolution.

They even called him a saint. I suggest they do not know the meaning of the word.

And all their flags they flew at half mast.

I remember no flags flown at half mast for the abandoned boys of the Pueblo.

I remember no flags flown at half mast for the massacred boys of the Liberty.

I remember no flags flown at half mast for the thousands of betrayed boys who gasped their last in the mud of a Vietnam war they were not permitted to win.

I remember no flags flown at half mast for the dozens of brave policemen who have been slain by black revolutionaries.

But I shall always remember the unspeakable hypocrisy with which both politician and priest have betrayed their country these last days in this sometime land of the free, sometime home of the brave.

MISS RUTH SIEBRANDS NAMED SOUTH DAKOTA'S SMALL BUSINESSWOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to Miss Ruth Siebrands of Redfield, S. Dak., who was named South Dakota's Small Businesswoman of the Year by the SBA last week.

The stated purposes of the Small Business Administration are to aid, counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business concerns. Through business loans, the SBA has helped thousands of firms get started, expand and prosper. Miss Siebrands is a fine example of the program's many successes.

Ruth Siebrands is the administrator of the James Valley Nursing and Convalescent Home in Redfield. Through SBA loans to the Redfield Rest Home Development Corp., she instigated construction of a 56-bed nursing home which has since had a 30-bed addition. The home now has 56 employees, including 11 registered nurses and two activity directors.

In addition to performing a valuable social service to the community, the home has been successful financially. Its bills are current, the first bank-SBA loan is prepaid well in advance, and the second loan is prepaid beyond 1970.

Again, my congratulations to Miss Siebrands for her outstanding achievement.

ARNHEITER CASE FACTS DISTORTED

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. William T. Generous, Jr., was the operations officer on the U.S.S. *Vance*, which figures so prominently in the well-publicized Arnheiter case.

Recently I announced to the House that I would place material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which presented the views of the junior officers aboard the *Vance* who, if one believes press stories and other sources of information, constituted a group of people strongly resembling beatniks and mutineers.

My constituent, Mr. Generous, recently wrote a letter to the editor of the Palo Alto Times which does present some information regarding his side of the story. The letter follows:

[From the Palo Alto Times, May 21, 1968]

ARNHEITER CASE FACTS DISTORTED

EDITOR OF THE TIMES:

I have just finished reading James J. Kilpatrick's column in your May 15 issue, and it, like the other products of the Arnheiter propaganda machine, is a monumental collection of distortions and untruths. The level of Mr. Kilpatrick's journalistic standards is evidenced by the fact that in the National Review for March 26, 1968, he gave me a physical description and a personality analysis in depth without ever having seen or talked to me. I wonder where he gets his information?

One look at the present column will tell. He says that "no one" from the Navy "turned up at Congressman Resnick's hearings." Of course not; Mr. Resnick, as the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Rural Development, has little jurisdiction in naval matters, and he tacitly admitted as much by turning the "hearing" over to Mr. Arnheiter's personal lawyer, Mr. Marvin Lewis, who reportedly conducted most of the questioning. No wonder they arrived at pro-Arneiter conclusions! The House Armed Services Committee (HASC) does have jurisdiction, however, and an exhaustive staff study completed only a few days before had found that, "During the period Lt. Commander Arnheiter was in command of the *Vance*, he violated many orders and regulations."

To return to Kilpatrick, the "evidence... that Arnheiter inherited a sloppy ship manned by an undisciplined crew" comes largely from a former seaman who despite his extraordinarily high native intelligence was unable to adapt to Navy life and was separated from the service with a general discharge for that reason. That man was on board *Vance* two full years before Mr. Arnheiter arrived in December 1965. He was not, therefore, a member of the crew that was awarded at least nine commendations during the eight months before that (six of them spent in Vietnam waters), a "Meritorious Conduct Ashore Award" six months before, a Navy Unit Commendation nomination six weeks before, and an Operational Readiness grade in the mid-90's six days before. The *Vance*, according to official Navy records, was "the ship to beat" for squadron honors at the moment Mr. Arnheiter came aboard.

By way of contrast, the HASC report indicates that Mr. Arnheiter's previous record "was very spotty," and that "the Navy was

taking a chance when it assigned (him) to command." As for what Mr. Kilpatrick calls his "obsessive love of fighting naval traditions," the same report shows that it was "obsessive" to the point where he ignored his assigned mission off the Vietnam coast to go into prohibited areas where he might shoot, filed false position reports, to conceal this, interfered with other ships that were supposed to be firing, and then finally fired at "enemy" targets that no one but Mr. Arnheiter ever saw.

The "bewildering array of malicious charges, cooked up by rebellious junior officers" also exists only in Mr. Arnheiter's mind. Official Navy records show that the reports that triggered his relief came not from the junior officers, but from such people as the COs and commodores of the ships interfered with as mentioned above, from the Vietnamese navy, from the U.S. commands ashore in Vietnam, etc. The discontent of the junior officers, who found themselves disgusted and unwilling accomplices in these irregularities (and many others) was nowhere in evidence until they were asked to testify at the investigation that followed the relief. (Incidentally, that testimony was given in only seven days, and although he had a full year in which to gather support and rebut it, Mr. Arnheiter was unable to overturn the evidence given at that time.) In fact, it was discovered that "it was only through the efforts of the ship's officers that the morale of the crew remained as high as it did," and that the officers "served their commanding officer to the best of their ability, under the circumstances," which were very trying, indeed.

The Times has been as conscientious in covering the affair as any other newspaper in the country, but now that the Navy has released the official records, I, as one who has been widely and untruthfully branded as the "ringleader" of this fictitious conspiracy, recommend you take another long, hard look at it. I think you'll find it a fraud.

WILLIAM T. GENEROUS, JR.

Mountain View.

SALE OF OIL AND GAS LEASES FOR OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago we had the Interior appropriations bill before us.

At that time I stated to you and Members of this House that the bill was largely self-sustaining.

I am in receipt of a letter from Boyd L. Rasmussen, Director of the Bureau of Land Management, which is as follows and in which I believe the Members will be interested:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,

Washington, D.C., May 28, 1968.

HON. JULIA B. HANSEN,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. HANSEN: On May 21 in New Orleans, Louisiana, we held a sale of oil and gas leases for Outer Continental Shelf lands off the coast of Texas.

Given below for your information, are the preliminary results of this sale as we have them to date:

Total of all bids-----	\$1,607,193,714.28
Total of high bids-----	\$602,485,716.88
Number of tracts offered--	169
Number of tracts bid-----	141
Highest bid on single tract -----	\$43,787,520.00

Successful bidder was the Texaco Oil Company. Though not a record high, this bid is exceeded only by the combine of Gulf, Texaco, Mobil and Union Oil Companies whose bid was \$61,418,000 during the February sale in California.

This sale now places our estimated FY 1968 total receipts at about \$1.4 billion of which about \$1.3 billion will be deposited in the General Fund of the U.S. Treasury.

As additional information about the sale becomes available, we will inform you of the significant items. We trust that this information is helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

BOYD L. RASMUSSEN,
Director.

IF A ROCK FALLS ON AN EGG

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an editorial of the Mental Health Newsletter of the Minnesota Department of Public Welfare. Written by Dr. David J. Vail, the department's director of medical services, the editorial calls attention to the folly of "stop and go" funding of Federal categorical aids. Dr. Vail deplores the uncertainty of funding which handicaps so many State-Federal joint efforts. For years I have sought to change Federal aid from categorical grants to block grants. I am convinced that block grants would end many of the difficulties cited in the following editorial titled, "Let's Do It Right":

LET'S DO IT RIGHT

The editorial in the November-December 1967 issue of the Mental Health Newsletter contained this statement:

"We ask . . . for an effective national government, that solves problems. We ask not solicitude, nor even necessarily benevolence, but at least a straight deal: honesty, stability, and lawful adherence to the Constitution."

In one of the Sherlock Holmes stories, the giveaway clue was the fact that the house watchdog did not bark. And so with the above statement: it is not remarkable in itself; its significance is that no one has challenged it.

While it apparently is not necessary to defend the statement, it appears appropriate to elaborate it. The questions of honesty and lawful adherence to the Constitution are being better and more appropriately debated elsewhere.

What about stability? In one sense we cannot complain of a Constitution which has endured for almost two hundred years. As citizens of the world's oldest living republic we should be proud of the stability of our national government.

But in another sense, at the level of the line tacticians in state and local governments, we have every reason to complain and be concerned. For the federal government is now and increasingly woven into the fabric of other levels of government and the vicissitudes of funding and of changes in laws and regulations at the federal level have a terrific impact locally.

For example, P.L. 89-313, an amendment to the Primary and Secondary Education Act of 1966, provided funds for education programs

for handicapped children in institutions. These were most welcome in Minnesota state institutions for the mentally retarded and mentally ill, where they were put to use in establishing numerous patient learning programs with an emphasis in special education activities in small groups. Thus children who had been living under conditions of severe emotional deprivation could begin to enjoy personal relationships and were coming alive. But in the second year of the program the funds were drastically reduced, which meant that over a third of the education activities were wiped out. It would have been less cruel not to have started them in the first place. The caper to this tragic story is the January 5, 1968 memo from the Office of Education, which contains this astonishing statement: "P.L. 89-313 funds will no longer be subject to reduction because of limited appropriations. This not only results in added funds but in considerably more stability since participants can now anticipate reliably the level of funding from one year to the next." What is amazing here is the spectacle of the mighty U.S. government—the mightiest government of all time—having to assure and persuade its clients that it can be trusted.

Another example is the tomfoolery surrounding the mental health services grants under Section 314d of P.L. 89-749. The exact amount available to Minnesota for the fiscal year 1967-68 was not known until mid-January 1968, almost seven months after the fiscal year had started. During this time we were advised of half a dozen different possible spending levels. The result was a total inability to plan for proper use of the funds. Now the states are caught in the effect of a new ruling which reduces the proper use of funds for state program administration; in Minnesota at least this will have the effect of reducing the grant and will create severe administrative mischief. It has almost come to the point where one must play on margin, and plan on using federal funds for nickel-and-dime projects that won't cause serious repercussions when the funding collapses. We would almost be better off without the stupid grants; but life isn't that simple, for the public expects the state and local government operator to get every penny of federal money that is available.

But the big, institutionalized programs like education, health, and welfare are bastions of security compared to off-beat agencies like OEO. For example, the Foster Grandparent Project in Minnesota, sponsored by OEO, is literally living from hand to mouth, and is forced to borrow from private banks to keep going between sporadic grants from Washington.

One could go on and on. The word these days is "creative federalism" and "partnership." But the partnership is often like that of the egg and the rock in the Turkish proverb: "If a rock falls on an egg, it's too bad for the egg. But if the egg falls on the rock, it's too bad for the egg."

The problem goes much deeper than just the malaise of state and local bureaucracies. It goes to our values as a people. For if we look at what is stable in the long-run pattern of federal spending, the answer is chilling: item number one is money that pays for past, present and future wars.

The problem goes to the division between executive and legislative branches. When they clash, as occurred in the fall of 1967, it is the programs and the countless recipients of the programs who suffer.

The problem also goes to the lack of a comprehensive policy of national planning. No industrialist or merchant in his right mind would run his business the way we allow our government to operate, lurching from crisis to crisis and making it up as it goes along.

This nation is, as sailors would say, in irons. This refers to the situation when a boat in trying to come about from one tack to another gets caught dead into the wind.

The spars shudder and the boat slips backward; control is lost. It is a time of extreme danger.

Can we get out of irons? Can we come of age as a people, and move onto a course, a program, of problem-solving? Are we ready for a comprehensive policy of national planning? Planning: "Intelligent cooperation with the inevitable." The answer will no doubt be determined in this year of ordeal and decision.

FORMAL DEDICATION OF THE CUMMINGS BROTHERS POST NO. 1436

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed proud to be a participant in the dedication of the new memorial building of the Cummings Brothers Post No. 1436 of the American Legion, at 4516 Avenue D, Brooklyn, N.Y., on March 31, 1968. This dedication marked the culmination for a planned permanent memorial to the valor of Joseph and John Cummings. I now have the privilege of bringing to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives three speeches which were made on the occasion of the dedication by Mr. Louis E. Drago, national executive committeeman of the American Legion; Mr. William F. Kennion, Jr., commander of the Cummings Brothers Post; and Mr. S. Michael Oliva, Kings County commander of the American Legion.

The speeches follow:

ADDRESS GIVEN BY LOUIS E. DRAGO, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEEMAN, AMERICAN LEGION, AT THE FORMAL DEDICATION OF CUMMINGS BROTHERS POST NO. 1436, NEW BUILDING, MARCH 31, 1968

Few things could give me a National Officer greater pleasure than to speak on this occasion.

We are met to-day to dedicate a new building for the American Legion.

The rich heritage of the American Legion is not gained merely by meetings in these Legion Halls, or even by attaining greater affluence and material prestige in the community. But rather by living up to the purposes of the American Legion, for God and Country—Service to Community, State and Nation, by living in a brotherly spirit among our neighbors with open minds and sensitive spirits, seeking to relate ourselves to the world in which we live, to our fellow-man and to God.

From this day, this American Legion building will have as a living part of its community, the names of two brothers, two American heroes, to whom our new building is dedicated; Joseph and John Cummings.

I hope and trust that this beautiful building is an investment in the future, and to wager our faith in the coming generation.

And so, on behalf of the National Organization of the American Legion, I join in this dedication for commemoration which is so necessary in these trying times to combat the unpatriotic, disloyal, immoral and lawless breed who would destroy our great work that of perpetuating the American Way of Life.

Cummings Brothers Post No. 1436 while having great confidence in the Almighty, nevertheless seem to believe too, that the good Lord helps those who help themselves.

Consequently, this Legion Hall is the cumulative fruition of the innumerable and dedicated hours of work by its members who believe in the American Legion and its great principles.

In this day of battle between light and darkness, let us all resolve to strengthen our Faith in the American Legion, in our beautiful country; that we shall preserve, protect and defend our inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, not only for ourselves but for all mankind.

To-day we live in a world of the juvenile gang and the juvenile delinquent. Yet this strange and sad world is also part of our life to-day, and must be dealt with.

We are waking up to the fact that many of the young people of America are estranged—estranged from their families, churches, and schools, and at war with society.

In place of the adjusted youth of the past—who had a clearly established place in his family and in his community from earliest childhood—we have the young rebel—the outsider—the child enemy of adult society. We read of inexplicable murders and acts of violence taking place among youngsters in our cities, we hear of thefts and crimes in suburban areas, we see skidmarks of recklessness on our highways, and watch the mounting toll of injury and death in the traffic accidents of teen-agers.

We are shocked by statistics that reveal the high percentages of drug addicts and criminal records among young people.

What causes these conditions is another story and has no place here to-day; but mass media, disdain for hard work and achievement.

The many false standards that have crept into our social attitudes, are contributing causes of these conditions.

Up to now, we have been a complacent people, reposing in our belief that we are unsurpassable in all things, technologically, in wealth and in power. But to-day we are face to face with dread possibilities—destruction from within and destruction from without. The Communists have surpassed us on many things, and our foundations at home are crumbling from human termite attacks.

We must return to those simple virtues of hard work, responsibility, and self-sacrifice that underlie most of our achievements.

This means a quickening of our patriotism, a regeneration of our national spirit, and a rebirth of responsibility. No more business as usual or pleasure as usual—by the policy of letting George do the hard things while we go on enjoying our own selfish pastimes.

Let us enshrine once more in our hearts and in public life, those old bed-rock virtues which made our nation great. America needs our help, all we can give her, and she will repay us, everyone, to the full and overflowing.

ADDRESS AND INTRODUCTIONS BY WILLIAM F. KENNION JR., COMMANDER, CUMMINGS BROTHERS POST NO. 1436, AMERICAN LEGION, AT THE FORMAL DEDICATION OF NEW BUILDING, MARCH 31, 1968

Thank you Bill for your very kind introduction.

Reverend clergy, members of Cummings family, National Executive Committeeman, the Honorable Lou Drago, County Commander Mike Oliva and Staff, County Chairlady Mrs. Gloria Billington and Staff, distinguished guests, fellow legionnaires and ladies of the Auxiliary, and Gold Star Mothers;

Of the twenty previous Cummings Brothers Post Commanders, who all served with great distinction, I am most pleased and honored to be the one to act as your host today and welcome you all to our formal dedication.

This has been quite a year for our Post, having one of our own past Commanders at-

tain the high office of County Commander and despite the enormous task of renovating our building we have been very active in all of the American Legion programs, particularly Child Welfare and Americanism.

We reached our membership quota of 207 prior to March 15th the beginning of the 50th year of the American Legion and before the County Convention time I predict an all time high to exceed 250.

All of these, climaxed by the completion of our new building which we are all proud of and very pleased with, a befitting memorial to our Standard Bearers, Joseph and John Cummings.

As your host, I have the pleasure of presenting to you our distinguished guests, all of whom have served our Community and the American Legion with great distinction. We have invited them because we of Cummings Brothers Post like them, we like what they stand for and we like the job they are doing.

May I present to you the Pastor of Little Flower who was so generous in permitting us to celebrate our beautiful memorial mass this morning in his church, the Reverend Father James Smyth.

The County Chaplain of the American Legion, Reverend Alfred Thompson.

National Executive Committeeman of the American Legion, Mr. Louis Drago who we shall hear from later.

Our own contribution to the success this year of the Kings County American Legion, one who held practically every office of this Post and who was Post Commander at the time I joined Cummings Brothers, our own County Commander, Mike Oliva.

Mike's very competent "Aid" and another member of Cummings Brothers Post who served as Commander and who we all love and respect for his continuous efforts so much so that we bestowed a life membership on him, John Cincotta.

The "work horse" of Kings County American Legion, the man every Post is deeply grateful to, particularly Cummings Brothers, County Adjutant Steve Sanzillo.

One of Cummings Brothers very best friends and Past County Commander, presently our Second District Vice Commander, Al Caccamo.

Our very capable Chief Division Commander of Kings County, Jim Werner.

Every successful venture generally owes most of its success to a woman. We, in Kings County are no different and here she is, County Chairlady of the Kings County Auxiliary, Mrs. Gloria Billington.

Our very good friend and County Judge Advocate the Honorable Judge Kopff.

We are very proud and pleased to have with us Past County Commanders; George Gaffney, Ed Rhatigan and Jack Friedman.

Our next guest is very close to the hearts of the members of Cummings Brothers because of his tremendous contributions of time, effort and money to the youth of Brooklyn. The Youth Center in Brownsville is a living and lasting testimony to this and is only one of his many accomplishments. Our guest speaker today and Chief Executive Officer of the Borough of Brooklyn, the Honorable Abe Stark.

Our very capable and charming Congresswoman, 12th District, Mrs. Edna F. Kelly. It was certainly gratifying to read that despite the "stacked deck" this year, Edna will be right in the fight for us.

Another member of Cummings Brothers Post who makes me feel proud that I belong, our State Senator, 17th District, Jerry Bloom.

The man who is considered to be Cummings Brothers' greatest benefactor, since, any time we need outside help regardless of the nature of the problem he is there ready and willing, and in every case we have racked up a satisfactory conclusion because of his efforts, State Assemblyman, 43rd District, George Cinotta.

The Community and Cummings Brothers are deeply grateful to our next guest, City Councilman, 23rd District, Harry Maze.

The great spirit of reciprocity existing between the American Legion and the Jewish War Veterans is largely due to our very dear friend and County Commander of the Jewish War Veterans, Joseph W. Flatow.

The American Legion, as you all know is dedicated to the service of the Community, State and Nation. Our next guest fosters this great principle, our own Post Executive Committeeman and President of the Community Action Committee, Mr. Patrick Joseph Curran.

Another great community leader and friend of Cummings Brothers Post, President of the Hyde Park Association, Mr. Vincent Gallagher.

The next guest is very dear to me and my great Post. This Community is most fortunate to have in its confines the Great La Salle Council of the Knights of Columbus which like the American Legion is dedicated to the principles of God and Country. I am very proud to be a member of this great council and it gives me great pleasure to present my Grand Knight, Mr. Wally More.

We are also very pleased to have with us today the District Leader of the Civic Republican Club, Mr. Danny Camola.

I am also proud to present the Past President of the Robert Jordan Conservative Club, present President of The Little Flower Little League and member of Cummings Brothers Post, Mr. John Olquist.

The next group of Guests are very special guests to us and have contributed the most possible to the success of America's freedom story, the lives of their sons. Our most recent Gold Star Mothers of this Community, Mrs. Eileen Jordan, Mrs. Margaret Furlong, Mrs. Oliver Reilly and family and Mrs. Kenneth Gibbons and family.

To climax the introductions today may I present to you members of a very proud and honorable family:

Mr. and Mrs. James Cummings.
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Cummings.
Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Cummings.
Mr. Raymond Cummings.

The four surviving brothers of Joseph and John, and the sisters:

Mrs. Charles B. Connors and family, and Mrs. Alice Shine, who because of distance (California) could not be with us.

We also have Aunt Mary and Aunt Charlotte with us.

Our own Ladies Auxiliary President of Cummings Brothers Unit and wife of Thomas Cummings, Therese.

I apologize deeply to any distinguished guest who was kind enough to be with us today and who I may have overlooked in my introductions. I shall now turn the meeting over to our County Commander, Mike Oliva.

ADDRESS GIVEN BY S. MICHAEL OLIVA, COUNTY COMMANDER, KINGS COUNTY AMERICAN LEGION, AT THE FORMAL DEDICATION OF CUMMINGS BROTHERS POST'S NEW BUILDING, MARCH 31, 1968

Mr. Chairman, Bill Young, Reverend Clergy, the Cummings Family, My Post Commander, William Kennion, National Executive Committeeman of the American Legion, The Honorable Louis E. Drago, The Honorable Abe Stark, President of the Borough of Brooklyn, Distinguished Guests, Fellow Legionnaires, Members of the American Legion Auxiliary of Kings County, Ladies and Gentlemen, and Friends:

It is my privilege to appear before you this day and to participate in this building dedication.

Our Post has set aside a day each year to honor our departed Comrades and, in addition, to honor Joseph and John Cummings, our Standard Bearers, who made the supreme sacrifice in order that we may con-

tinue to enjoy the principles of Justice, Freedom and Democracy.

We pause momentarily to reflect on the deeds accomplished by these two men, whose names we honor and respect.

Joseph Cummings enlisted in the U.S. Army on April 21, 1941 and was assigned to the 454th Ordnance Company. In the fall, his unit left for the Philippines and arrived at Manila on November 27, 1941, as the dark clouds of war formed on the horizon.

The treacherous Japanese attack followed and Joe fought all through the historic Battle of Bataan, in which he was wounded and captured by the enemy. He was in the infamous "Death March" and died at Camp McDonnell as a Prisoner of War on August 4, 1942.

John Cummings at 17 enlisted in the Marine Corps on November 27, 1943, and was assigned to the 24th Regiment as a Machine Gunner. He engaged the enemy on Saipan and on February 20, 1945 died in action on the Black Sand of Iwo Jima.

Both of these stalwart men were interested in the field of athletic and youth programs. Both were former employees of the Brooklyn Baseball Club.

In furthering the interests of our Standard Bearers, this Post has fostered many athletic events and sponsored youth programs and activities.

We have devoted our time, money and efforts in supporting numerous teams in the fields of Baseball, Football, Track and other sports.

Through our participation on the Post level and County level, we of Cummings Brothers Post have carried out the many programs formulated by the American Legion and to which we are dedicated.

Our activities in the Americanism program have earned us the Department of New York Americanism Plaque, of which we are extremely proud.

In the area of Child Welfare, Cummings Brothers Post has won first place on the County and Department levels and in addition, recognition on the National level.

Our Post, in its inception, was small, not only in the number of members, but also in funds.

However, our members have always been enthusiastic and dedicated, who believe in the principles and programs of the American Legion.

Our sponsorship of the numerous activities has brought our Post to a position of influence and prestige, which it now enjoys, not only in the neighborhood, but in the County, City and State.

Today we are assembled here for still another purpose. That purpose is to create a Perpetual Testimonial to the memory of our Standard Bearers Joseph and John Cummings and to all men who gave their lives to safeguard the principles upon which our Country was founded. These principles are clearly set forth in the Constitution of the United States and the Preamble of the American Legion.

In addition thereto, this building represents the realization of lives' ambitions of the members of the Cummings Brothers Post.

I am extremely proud to have been chosen to participate in these dedication ceremonies and to address you this day, not only as the County Commander of Kings County, to which office you were instrumental in electing me, but as a member and former Officer of this Post.

May this edifice stand as a living monument to the two Cummings Brothers and to all other Veterans who gave their lives for this country so that Democracy can live, and to those members of this Post, both living and dead, who devoted their energies to aid our youth, our elders and our brother veterans, so as to make their lives happier.

In conclusion, let us not forget our love for God and Country and may we continue to serve the Community, State and Nation.

A CONSTITUENT LOOKS AT THE GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME PROPOSAL

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, questionnaires and polls taken by Members of Congress have a common objective—to find out what constituents are thinking and how they want their Representative to vote on key issues. In response to a recent poll of mine in the First Congressional District of New Hampshire, many citizens took the time to write me at some length concerning subjects referred to in the poll and other problems as well.

One of the chief domestic challenges Congress faces is how to legislate constructively in helping poor people in this prosperous Nation. On this subject I am inserting in the Record, with her permission, a most interesting and constructive letter from Mrs. Edna G. Walker of Manchester, N.H. Where to draw the so-called poverty line is difficult and her thinking goes directly to the problem.

The letter follows:

MANCHESTER, N.H.,

May 18, 1968.

LOUIS C. WYMAN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WYMAN: Thank you for the enclosed card. I have answered the questions and while some of them require more than just a no or yes answer, I guess the card generally reflects my ideas. I do not feel qualified to sound off too much on Vietnam, but let me say that I am not a pacifist and I do not believe in pacification. I am old enough to remember the Englishman with the umbrella that was going to "have peace in our time" when dealing with Hitler.

I am not given much to writing letters and this is the first letter that I have ever written to any public office in any form, but I feel so strongly about the so called Civil Rights and riots that I must make my voice heard, however weak it may be.

First let me congratulate you. I read in the paper that you supported an amendment that would deny Federal funds to rioting students. Good for you.

Second, let me say, that when I use the pronoun "we" that I reflect, more or less, the general ideas of friends and neighbors probably 50 more or less. This is in just casual conversation, I have not taken any poll. And let me say also that if I refer to myself, I am not in any way complaining or asking for help in any way whatsoever, it is just facts and figures.

I believe in equal rights; equal rights to vote, equal rights to work and equal rights to live anywhere one can afford and will maintain neighborhood standards. But I do not believe in privilege. I know plenty of mothers that work, work to support small children, work to send their children to college. Why should any one group feel they have a right to demand support? They complain on the TV that they are treated like second rate citizens, well as far as I am concerned any able bodied person that ac-

cepts welfare for more than a short time when down on their luck is a second rate citizen.

Are they serious when they demand a guaranteed annual wage? One leader quoted a figure of \$3,000 for a single person and \$6,000 for a family of four.

I never made as much as \$3,000 in any one year in my life, and I mean that I worked for 30 years, 50 weeks a year for about 25 of the 30 years, the other 5 years having less time on account of my health. I am going to be 59 this summer and have had to retire on account of a back ailment. It took me 19 months to have my Social Security pension granted, and that is for something that I paid taxes on all those many years, and now I have an annual wage of just under \$1,300 a year. And they want an annual wage, for what?

I live in a quiet well-kept neighborhood and we all own our own houses. My brother and I live in houses side by side, and we got them by buying a pile of boards and a keg of nails and going to it. If we want the house painted we buy a can of paint and start pushing a brush, etc. This goes for nearly everyone in the neighborhood, the women too. My friend across the street is 66 and she does all of her own painting inside and out and works rather than draw her Social Security. My sister-in-law works, and for the most part paints her own house inside and out and keeps up the yard, and by the way, she is quite lame, one leg is about 5 inches shorter than the other. So you can see that all these pitiful pictures on TV and in magazines of tumble down shacks and garbage littered yards fall on rather deaf ears as far as we are concerned. Oh yes, I almost forgot, most of us can't afford too many commercial clothes, we cannot afford them, if want a new dress we get out the sewing machine. We are not freaks, we represent the large majority across the length and breadth of the land.

The "poor" need help, help to help themselves, but first let every able bodied person get up and pick up. If the "poor" spent as much energy and money fixing up their homes as they have spent and will spend on marching to Washington, they would have a lot more. If they spent as much energy fighting rats as they spend on rioting, the poor rats would be no more. We would all have rats if we did not take care, yes even here.

In case you have read this far, I just wanted to say I hope somebody that can be heard will raise a voice of protest and not buckle under to political blackmail, for that is all it is.

Very truly yours,

EDNA G. WALKER.

P.S.—In case you think that I am sub-standard as far as wages, I am only average, some did a little better and some a little worse. Of course some had the strength to work overtime, which I could never do. If you don't know that the women office workers in New Hampshire are not very well paid, you should know it. Of course, bear in mind that I had to stop working in 1966 which was before the last two minimum wage increases.

EGW.

WHAT ARE THE POOR PEOPLE FOR AND AGAINST?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it would be absurd to think that the poor

camped in Resurrection City, so-called, think of the American flag as a "rag on a stick," or would eliminate the "God versus devil philosophy of Judeo-Christian tradition," or further "re-orient" the police, presumably away from law enforcement even further; or believe that all public officials, liberal or conservative, are Fascists.

To believe this would be absurd. But to attribute these beliefs to a leader of the poor people's campaign would not be too far afield. Unfortunately, by following such men as the irreverent James Bevel, the poor are lending the weight of their names and numbers to statements such as these. For these were part of Bevel's statements of the campaign's aims.

Until a full treatment of his statement is available, I offer an eye opening column by Chicago Tribune staff writer, Willard Edwards. This column appeared in the June 4 edition.

CAPITOL VIEWS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, June 3.—The Capitol hill forum had been provided by Sen. Percy [R., Ill.] but the Rev. James Bevel of Chicago gave a contemptuous brush-off to his host [who was mercifully absent] in a long harangue.

"I endorsed Percy for the Senate in Illinois," he remarked. "But only because he was running against an old man [Ex-Sen. Douglas] and I don't have much confidence in old men."

Bevel, it developed, had no confidence at all in any American official in authority. He lumped them all as "fascists," including both conservatives and liberals in this category. It didn't matter who was President, he said, because the capitalist system was defunct and "economic class warfare" had arrived. Loyalty to country was an out-dated concept when that country was waging an unjust war in Viet Nam.

"I feel no responsibility to a nation-state," he remarked. "I represent conscious energy which is a universal phenomenon. As a result, I don't get too excited when I see a rag on a stick which is called a flag."

A transcript of Bevel's remarks is under study in Congress. Delivered May 21, they were far more unguarded than other statements he has since made in public. He did not know they were being recorded. The congressional staff assistants who assembled to hear him at Percy's suggestion agreed that they were hearing a theme taken from the utopian phases of the philosophy of Karl Marx. They so reported to members of Congress who confessed themselves deeply disturbed.

Bevel is a high-ranking leader in the poor people's campaign, now in its fourth week in Washington. He is in charge of maintaining discipline among the demonstrators. Thus far, despite some broken windows in the Supreme court building and a few arrests, the demonstrations have been generally mild and restrained.

SPEAKS WITH DEADLY SERIOUSNESS

But Bevel's statement of the campaign's aims has served to keep uneasiness at a peak in Congress. He impressed his listeners with a sense of his deadly seriousness in calling for a complete reshaping of the American system of government.

"He speaks quietly and does not aim for emotionalism like [the Rev. Ralph D.] Abernathy," one aid reported to his senator. "I think we are kidding ourselves if we think that we are just dealing with misguided radicals. This man, for all his cover-alls and

Castro-type beard, was intelligent, articulate and calculating."

Despite passionate denials by leaders of the campaign that Communists have infiltrated its ranks, Bevel preached a straight Marxist line. Ironically, he lost his temper only when he referred to Rep. Albert W. Watson [R., S.C.], who took the House floor recently to reveal what he claimed was evidence that Communists helped plan the march on Washington.

Bevel mentioned Watson so often that some listeners regarded it as significant. Bevel's wife is the former Diane Nash, a former civil rights leader in Tennessee, whose passport was revoked after she and three other women made an unauthorized trip to communist North Viet Nam. On their return, the women accused the United States of atrocities and lauded Ho Chi Minh.

Bevel told the staff aids that the Washington march was "a great human theatrical drama enacted to educate the people." In this great play, senators and congressmen, police, apathetic citizens, and poor people were actors.

SOME SCENES WILL BE VIOLENT

"You people got to understand what we mean by non-violence is not just some people marching peaceably in a parade," he said. "We mean the whole restructuring of our inter-relationships."

"Some of the scenes will be violent. If there's violence, we won't worry about it. We will come back and re-educate."

"Our goals are to eliminate all disciplinary relationships. We do not believe in a parent making a kid conform to a certain norm. That is a violent relationship. We want to eliminate it."

"The wealth must be re-distributed and the means of production turned over to the people. Money is a product of militarization. Armaments must be eliminated. The police must be re-oriented. The God versus devil philosophy of Judeo-Christian tradition must be eliminated."

"Personally, capitalism is intellectually incompatible with me. Why should I compete for things that are mine?"

He left a deeply troubled audience, many of them convinced that Bevel's "great human theatrical drama" will have a violent climax.

EDITORIAL THAT CONCERNS ALL AMERICANS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bob Watson, general manager of KGNC-TV and radio in Amarillo, Tex., presented an excellent editorial on May 5. I insert the following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I feel the editorial touches on something that should be of concern to all Americans.

The editorial follows:

KGNC EDITORIAL

(By Bob Watson)

In this troubled world of ours today, subject to sudden and sometimes shocking change, there has been perhaps no change more dismaying than that in the smaller world of academe, the environment of our universities and colleges, a minority of whose students seem somehow to have determined that they and not the academic authorities should control these institutions which are supported by someone else . . . quite someone else.

The newest manifestation of this anarchist trend is the so-called sit-in, in its most recent major instance embellished additionally by the seizure or restraint of hostages and by the vandalism of the office of the president at a revered university of the Ivy League. "Sit-in" is a mild way indeed to describe the forcible occupation by a small minority of the student body of key buildings and the exclusion of the right-thinking majority from classes, plus interim wanton destruction and damage amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars.

It seems strange to us that these students involve themselves deliberately in an unlawful situation and then act surprised and outraged when the University at long last timidly moves to protect itself. It's as if these minority students were saying "we have rights—but no one else has."

Blossoming anarchists were encouraged and condoned, as too often before, in advanced stages of the latest sit-in, by a small segment of faculty members, and even some of these had to be removed forcibly. These more mature and presumably more responsible people are more guilty than undergraduate and graduate students. It is time for guilt to be punished by expulsion of law-defying students and discharge of abetting teachers. For responsibility again to rule the classrooms and the dormitories whose halls of ivy during recent years have become infested with the creeping growth of poison ivy instead.

MAPLE HEIGHTS HIGH MUSTANGS ARE OHIO WRESTLING CHAMPIONS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I salute the Mustangs of Maple Heights, Ohio, High School. For the third consecutive year they have won the Ohio wrestling championship. It is the seventh time in the last 13 years that our Maple Heights mat team has captured first place in State competition.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD an article from the outstanding newspaper which serves this community, the Maple Heights Press, and a commendatory resolution adopted by Mayor Lisy and the Maple Heights City Council:

THIRD STRAIGHT YEAR—STATE CHAMPS AGAIN

(By Bob Nozar)

No! Beaver Creek didn't win it. Parma Valley Forge and Toledo St. Francis finished second and third respectively but they weren't tops either. Upper Arlington with four boys in the tourney scored only two points. Martins Ferry, also with four qualifiers wasn't much higher.

So who is the number one mat team in the state? None other than the Maple Heights Mustangs, under the coaching of Mike Milkovich. Yes sir, for the third year in a row, and the seventh time in the last 13 years Maple Heights is the Ohio State Wrestling Champions.

Maple scored 44 points to Valley Forge's 38 for its first place finish. The crowd at St. John Arena was divided into two groups. It was the people from Maple, and the people against the Mustangs. The anti-Maple crowd had nothing to cheer about Friday as the

Mustangs pulled all five of their state qualifiers through to the semi-finals.

Tom Milkovich took his second consecutive state crown in the action at 112 pounds. He won it last year at 103. Tom scored a pin in the first round Friday as he flattened Bill Seipel in 4:37. Later on in the day he defeated Bill Walter of Lakewood 12-2.

In the semi-finals Saturday afternoon Tom took on Walker Stevenson of Sandusky Perkins. In the first period Tom had a takedown, but Stevenson escaped. In the second frame Stevenson got a reverse, which was followed by an escape by Milkovich which left the match at three all after two periods. But in the third Tom turned on the steam, and got an escape, a takedown, and two near-pins for a 12-3 win.

In the championship bout Tom took on John Meros of Euclid in a repeat of their district final. Tom won again as he got two takedowns, and a reverse for the 6-2 victory.

Lon Hicks at 120 won his two matches Friday as he rolled up a 12-1 win over George Zollinger of Toledo DeVillbis, and then trounced Randy Breit of Marlinton 11-3.

In the semi's Lon met Bob Mason of Parma and scored the first takedown, but Mason escaped and got a takedown of his own. In the second period Lon got a reverse which was followed by a Mason escape leaving the score at 4-4. Mason got two more points in the third period with a reverse to give him a 6-4 win. Mason was eventually the state champ.

In a consolation round bout Lon defeated Wayne Hardy of Huron 7-3. He took third place in the state with a 4-2 decision of Frank Yoo of Eastlake North. Lon had a takedown and a reverse in that one.

Tom Barrett scored a 3-2 win over Leroy Noyd in his opening match Friday. Tom got a late reverse to wrap up a 9-6 decision of Derek Bartlett of Huron in the quarter final match.

Then Saturday afternoon he met Bob Lade of Valley Forge. In that one Barrett got the first takedown and rode Lade out. Lade got an escape and a penalty point in the third period to tie the score. Late in the match Lade was on his back, but no points were awarded to Barrett. In the overtime that followed Lade got the only escape for a 1-0 win. He won the state crown that evening.

In consolations Tom beat Bob Johnson of Dayton Meadowdale 5-3.

Then in the finals of the consolation rounds he beat what was left of Beaver Creek, Logan Martinez, 3-1. He had an escape and a penalty point, along with riding time for his third place finish.

That win wrapped up the state crown for the Mustangs.

At 133 Bill Black breezed through his class for the state championship. In his first bout he beat Bill Fisher of Toledo Rogers 10-1. Then later on that day he pinned Larry Branson of Lorain in 2:53.

On Saturday he beat Don Akerman of Martins Ferry 13-3.

Then in the championship finals he beat Bob Tschol of Toledo St. Francis. Bill had three takedowns, a predicament, and an escape for a 9-3 win.

Derek Bekeny also won his first two matches beating Rick Greene of Columbus DeSalles 7-5, and then decisively Bruce Witzke of Strongsville 5-2.

Saturday afternoon he lost an overtime referee's decision to the future state champ Dennis Toffler of St. Francis. The score was 1-1 at the end of the overtime. It was a split decision, with the referee and one judge voting for Toffler, and the other judge voting for Bekeny.

Derek lost a close match to the third place finisher Bruce Hrycyk of Copley in a consolation round bout.

Paul E. Landis the Commissioner of the O.H.S.A.A. awarded the first place trophy to Coach Mike Milkovich and his crew amidst the cheers of the Mustang followers.

RESOLUTION 1968-47

A resolution commending the Maple Heights High School wrestling team, its coaches, and the administrative officers of the Maple Heights city school system, upon the attainment of the third consecutive Ohio State wrestling championship for the 1967-1968 season

Whereas, the 1967-1968 Wrestling Team of Maple Heights High School was proclaimed Ohio State Wrestling Champion for the third consecutive year in Columbus, Ohio, on February 24, 1968, in competition with teams representing high schools throughout the State of Ohio, and

Whereas, this Council recognizes that such achievement is the result of steady application of exercise, practice, and training while maintaining scholastic studies, and that such achievement of necessity reflects the inspirational leadership of the team's coaches, Mr. Michael Milkovich, Mr. Patrick J. Palumbo and Mr. William Barrett, and the Athletic Director Mr. T. Donovan Wylie, and

Whereas, this Council further recognizes that even though two of the members of the team were individual titlists, the season's record is a team product, and accordingly this Council desires to commend all of the team members and the Coaches on behalf of itself, the Administrative and Judicial Departments of and for Maple Heights, and the citizens of Maple Heights, and

Whereas, on behalf of the same agencies and individuals, this Council desires further to express its commendation to the representatives and of the Maple Heights City School District for their cooperation in assisting the Coaches and members of the Wrestling Team in carrying out the wrestling program while first providing and requiring compliance with educational standards.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Council of the City of Maple Heights, State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. On Behalf of the City of Maple Heights, the Council and the Administrative and Judicial Departments of and for the City of Maple Heights, and the people of the City of Maple Heights, do herewith express their commendation and congratulations to the Coaches and students of the Maple Heights High School Wrestling Team for the honor and recognition accorded this City through their efforts as hereinbefore expressed.

Be it further resolved, that the Clerk of Council be and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this Resolution to the following persons: Mr. Harry Salisbury, Superintendent of Schools; Mr. Michael Milkovich, Head Coach; Mr. William T. Barrett and Mr. Patrick J. Palumbo, Assistant Coaches; Mr. Charles Pickens, Principal, Maple Heights High School; Mr. T. Donovan Wylie, Athletic Director.

MEMBERS OF THE 1967-68 WRESTLING TEAM

Thomas Barrett, Derek Bekeny, William Black, John Blank, Pat Bowen, Conrad Calander, Frank Cikach, Lon Hicks, Mark Hicks, Dale Hlavin, Jim Jedlicka, John Morrell, Thomas Milkovich, Cliff Radi, and Louis Churney, Manager.

SECTION 2. This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

Passed March 6, 1968.

ROBERT J. LOUGH,
President of Council.
EMIL J. LISY, Jr.,
Mayor.

JOHN J. WETZEL,
Clerk of Council.

THE AGE OF EFFLUENCE

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while benefits of our increasingly industrialized and technological society are vast, so are the problems. It is becoming clear and more and more urgent to realize that as we have made great gains for the good of mankind, we are also in dire danger of destroying the very source of our wealth. Despite magnificent technological achievements in space, our air and water are unfit for consumption or recreation.

The degree of environmental pollution that has occurred in our Nation is alarming, and is increasing. It cannot continue. Yet we cannot expect to be effective in halting this trend while we continue to use archaic and uncoordinated methods to solve such complex problems as exist in our urban areas. The methods of problem solving must keep pace with the problems.

In 1966, I introduced a bill, now H.R. 20, to create a Commission on Public Management to study the application of technology—the comprehensive approach that systems analysis can offer—to find effective solutions to the vastly complicated public problems which include housing, transportation, and education, as well as the problem of pollution. A systems approach would involve a computer analysis of the total environment. As the editorial comments from Time magazine of May 10 points out well, only then can cities adequately and effectively make the necessary cost-benefit choices and balance the system. They will be able to get a complete picture of the problem and the alternative solutions—and the advantages and disadvantages in each one—to take action best suited to the problems and the facilities at hand.

I urge my colleagues to take to heart the seriousness of the situation and give their consideration to the urgency for new concepts of problem solving. The Time article is an excellent commentary on this critical issue, and I commend it for careful reading.

The article follows:

THE AGE OF EFFLUENCE

What ever happened to America the Beautiful? While quite a bit of it is still visible, the recurring question reflects rising and spreading frustration over the nation's increasingly dirty air, filthy streets and malodorous rivers—the relentless degradations of a once virgin continent. This man-made pollution is bad enough in itself, but it reflects something even worse: a dangerous illusion that technological man can build bigger and bigger industrial societies with little regard for the iron laws of nature.

The problem is much bigger than the U.S. The whole industrialized world is getting polluted, and emerging nations are unlikely to slow their own development in the interest of clearer air and cleaner water. The fantastic effluence of affluence is overwhelming natural decay—the vital process that balances life in the natural world. All living things produce toxic wastes, including their own corpses.

But whereas nature efficiently decays—and thus reuses—the wastes of other creatures, man alone produces huge quantities of synthetic materials that almost totally resist natural decay. And more and more such waste is poisonous to man's fellow creatures, to say nothing of himself.

Man has tended to ignore the fact that he is utterly dependent on the biosphere: a vast web of interacting processes and organisms that form the rhythmic cycles and food chains in which one part of the living environment feeds on another. The biosphere is no immutable feature of the earth. Roughly 400 million years ago, terrestrial life consisted of some primitive organisms that consumed oxygen as fast as green plants manufactured it. Only by some primeval accident were the greedy organisms buried in sedimentary rock (as the source of crude oil, for example), thus permitting the atmosphere to become enriched to a life-sustaining mix of 20% oxygen, plus nitrogen, argon, carbon dioxide and water vapor. With miraculous precision, the mix was then maintained by plants, animals and bacteria, which used and returned the gases at equal rates. About 70% of the earth's oxygen is thus produced by ocean phytoplankton: passively floating plants. All this modulated temperatures, curbed floods and nurtured man a mere 1,000,000 or so years ago.

To primitive man, nature was so harsh and powerful that he deeply respected and even worshiped it. He did the environment very little damage. But technological man, master of the atom and soon the moon, is so aware of his strength that he is unaware of his weakness—the fact that his pressure on nature may provoke revenge. Although sensational cries of impending doom have overstated the case, modern man has reached the stage where he must recognize that real dangers exist. Indeed, many scholars of the biosphere are now seriously concerned that human pollution may trigger some ecological disaster.

CONSUMING NOTHING

For one thing, the impact of human pollutants on nature can be vastly amplified by food chains, the serial process by which weak creatures are typically eaten by stronger ones in ascending order. The most closely studied example is the effect of pesticides, which have sharply improved farm crops but also caused spectacular kills of fish and wildlife. In the Canadian province of New Brunswick, for example, the application of only one-half pound of DDT per acre of forest to control the spruce budworm has twice wiped out almost an entire year's production of young salmon in the Miramichi River. In this process, rain washes the DDT off the ground and into the plankton of lakes and streams. Fish eat the DDT-tainted plankton; the pesticide becomes concentrated in their bodies, and the original dose ultimately reaches multifold strength in fish-eating birds, which then often die or stop reproducing. DDT is almost certainly to blame for the alarming decrease in New England's once flourishing peregrine falcons, northern red-shouldered hawks and black-crowned night herons.

In the polluting sense, man is the dirtiest animal, and he must learn that he can no longer afford to vent smoke casually into the sky and sewage into rivers as he did in an earlier day, when vast reserves of pure air and water easily diluted the pollutants. The earth is basically a closed system with a waste-disposal process that clearly has limits. The winds that ventilate earth are only six miles high; toxic garbage can kill the tiny organisms that normally clean rivers. Today, industrial America is straining the limits.

One massively important factor is that the U.S. consumer actually consumes nothing; he merely uses things, and though he burns, buries, grinds or flushes his wastes, the mate-

rial survives in some form, and technology adds to its longevity. The tin can used to rust away; now comes the immortal aluminum can, which may outlast the Pyramids. Each year, the U.S. produces 48 billion cans, plus 28 billion long-lived bottles and jars. Paced by hardy plastic containers, the average American's annual output of 1,600 lbs. of solid waste is rising by more than 4% a year. Disposal already costs \$3 billion a year.

All this effluence is infinitely multiplied in big cities—and 70% of Americans live on only 10% of the country's total land area. Every day, New York City dumps 200 million gallons of raw sewage into the Hudson River. Each square mile of Manhattan produces 375,000 lbs. of waste a day; the capital cost of incinerating that 1-sq.-mi.-output is \$1.87 million, and 30% of the residue drifts in the air as fly ash until it settles on the citizens.

The sheer bulk of big cities slows the cleansing winds, at the same time, rising city heat helps to create thermal inversions (warm air above cold) that can trap smog for days—a crisis that in 1963 killed 400 New Yorkers. Cars complete the deadly picture. While U.S. chimneys belch 100,000 tons of sulfur dioxide every day, 90 million motor vehicles add 230,000 tons of carbon monoxide (52% of smog) and other lethal gases, which then form ozone and peroxyacetyl nitrate that kill or stunt many plants, ranging from orchids to oranges. Tetraethyl lead in auto exhausts affects human nerves, increasing irritability and decreasing normal brain function. Like any metal poison, lead is fatal if enough is ingested. In the auto's 70-year history, the average American's lead content has risen an estimated 125-fold, to near maximum tolerance levels. Arctic glaciers now contain wind-wafted lead.

AIR, WATER AND THE SEWER

By the year 2000, an estimated 90% of Americans will live in urban areas and drive perhaps twice as many cars as they do now. The hope is that Detroit will have long since designed exhaust-free electric or steam motors. Another hope is nuclear power to generate electricity in place of smoggy "fossil fuels" (oil, coal), but even with 50% nuclear power, U.S. energy needs will so increase by 2000 that fossil-fuel use may quadruple. Moreover, nuclear plants emit pollution: not only radioactive wastes, which must be buried, but also extremely hot water that has to go somewhere and can become a serious threat to marine life.

Industry already devours water on a vast scale—600,000 gal. to make one ton of synthetic rubber, for example—and the resultant hot water releases the dissolved oxygen in rivers and lakes. This kills the oxygen-dependent bacteria that degrade sewage. Meanwhile, the country's ever-mounting sewage is causing other oxygen-robbing process. By 1980, these burdens may well dangerously deplete the oxygen in all 22 U.S. river basins. The first massive warning is what happened to Lake Erie, where overwhelming sewage from Detroit and other cities cut the oxygen content of most of the lake's center to zero, turning a once magnificently productive inland sea into a sink where life is catastrophically diminished. With state and federal aid, the cities that turned Erie's tributaries into open sewers are now taking steps to police the pollution, and if all goes well, Erie may be restored to reasonable life in five or ten years.

But the problem goes on. Though one-third of U.S. sewage systems are below health standards, improving them may also kill lakes. The problem is that treated sewage contains nitrate and phosphate, fertilizing substances widely used in agriculture that make things worse in overfertilized lakes. Though nitrate is normally harmless in the body, intestinal bacteria can turn it into

nitrite, a compound that hinders hemoglobin from transporting oxygen to the tissues, causing labored breathing and even suffocation.

THE SYSTEMS APPROACH

It seems undeniable that some disaster may be lurking in all this, but laymen hardly know which scientists to believe. As a result of fossil-fuel burning, for example, carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has risen about 14% since 1860. According to Ecologist Lamont C. Cole, man is thus reducing the rate of oxygen regeneration, and Cole envisions a crisis in which the amount of oxygen on earth might disastrously decline. Other scientists fret that rising carbon dioxide will prevent heat from escaping into space. They foresee a hotter earth that could melt the polar icecaps, raise oceans as much as 400 ft., and drown many cities. Still other scientists forecast a colder earth (the recent trend) because man is blocking sunlight with ever more dust, smog and jet contrails. The cold promises more rain and hail, even a possible cut in world food. Whatever the theories may be, it is an established fact that three poisons now flood the landscapes: smog, pesticides, nuclear fallout.

Finding effective antidotes will take a lot more alertness to ecological consequences. What cities sorely need is a systems approach to pollution: a computer analysis of everything that a total environment—greater Los Angeles, for example—is taking in and giving out via air, land, water. Only then can cities make cost-benefit choices and balance the system. Equally vital are economic incentives, such as taxing specific pollutants so that factories stop using them. Since local governments may be loath to levy effluence charges, fearing loss of industry, the obvious need is regional cooperation, such as interstate river-basin authorities to enforce scientific water use. Germany's Ruhr River is ably governed this way. A shining U.S. example is the eight-state Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission, which persuaded 3,000 cities and industries to spend \$1 billion diverting 99% of their effluent to sewage plants.

Similar "air shed" action is starting between some smog-bound states and is considered preferable to federally imposed air standards, which might not fit local climate conditions. Still, far greater federal action—especially money—is urgently needed to help cities build all kinds of waste-treating facilities. In fact, the Secretary of the Interior really ought to be the Secretary of the Environment. To unify federal leadership, he might well be given charge of the maze of rival federal agencies that now absurdly nibble only at their own slice of the pollution mess.

One of the prime goals in attacking pollution ought to be a vast shrinkage of the human impact on other creatures. The war on insects, for example, might actually go a lot better without chemical pesticides that kill the pests' natural enemies, such as birds. One of the best strategies is to nurture the enemies so they can attack the pests; more insect-resistant crops can also be developed. Florida eliminated the screw-worm fly not by spraying but by sterilizing hordes of the male flies, then liberating them to produce infertile eggs. A still newer method is the use of sex attractants to lure male insects into traps and thus to their death.

Above all, man should strive to parallel natural decay by recycling—reusing as much waste as possible. Resalvaging already keeps 80% of all mined copper in circulation. But U.S. city incinerators now destroy about 3,000,000 metric tons of other valuable metals a year; magnetic extractors could save the metal and reduce incineration by 10%. The packaging industry could do a profound service by switching to materials that rot—fast.

The perfect container for mankind is the edible ice-cream cone. How about a beer container that is something like a pretzel? Or the soft-drink bottle that, when placed in the refrigerator, turns into a kind of tasty artificial ice? Soft drinks could also come in frozen form, as popsicles with edible sticks.

To cut air pollution, a Japanese process can be used to convert fly ash into cinder blocks. Since the market is too small for commercial success, public subsidies would make sense; recovering waste at the source is almost always cheaper than cleanup later. There are some real prospects of profit in reconstituting other waste. Take sulfur, for example, which is in short supply around the world. While 26 million tons are mined a year, smokestacks belch 28 million tons of wasted sulfur dioxide, which could easily be trapped in the stack and converted to sulfuric acid or even fertilizer. Standard Oil of California is already profitably recovering the refinery sulfur waste that pollutes streams.

To reduce smog over cities, one of the most visible and worst forms of pollution, smog-causing power plants might be eliminated from densely populated areas. Why not generate electricity at the fuel source—distant oil or coal fields—and then wire it to cities? On the other hand, industrialization must not be taken to distant places that can be better used for other purposes. Industrializing Appalachia, for example, would smogify a naturally hazy region that settlers aptly named the Smokies. The right business for Appalachia is recreation; federal money could spur a really sizable tourist industry.

Sometimes pollution can even help recreation. In flat northeastern Illinois, for instance, the handsomest recreation area will soon be Du Page County's fast-rising 118-ft. hill and 65-acre lake—artfully built on garbage fill. One form of pollution could even enhance—rather than spoil—water sports. Much of the nation's coastline is too cold for swimming, if marine life can be protected why not use nuclear plant heat to warm the water? Or even create underwater national parks for scuba campers?

IN HARMONY WITH NATURE

Ideally, every city should be a closed loop, like a space capsule in which astronauts reconstitute even their own waste. This concept is at the base of the federally aided "Experimental City" being planned by Geophysicist Athelstan Spilhaus, president of Philadelphia's Franklin Institute, who dreams of solving the pollution problem by dispersing millions of Americans into brand-new cities limited to perhaps 250,000 people on 2,500 acres of now vacant land. The pilot city, to be built by a quasi-public corporation, will try everything from reusable buildings to underground factories and horizontal elevators to eliminate air-burning cars and buses. The goal is a completely recycled, noise-free, pure-air city surrounded by as many as 40,000 acres of insulating open countryside. "We need urban dispersal," says Spilhaus, "not urban renewal."

In the search for solutions, there is no point in attempting to take nature back to its pristine purity. The approach must look forward. There is no question that just as technology has polluted the country, it can also depollute it. The real question is whether enough citizens want action. The biggest need is for ordinary people to learn something about ecology, a humbling as well as fascinating way of viewing reality, that ought to get more attention in schools and colleges. The trouble with modern man is that he tends to yawn at the news that pesticides are threatening remote penguins or pelicans; perhaps he could do with some of the humility toward animals that St. Francis tried to graft onto Christianity. The false assumption that nature exists only to serve

man is at the root of an ecological crisis that ranges from the lowly litterbug to the lunacy of nuclear proliferation. At this hour, man's only choice is to live in harmony with nature, not conquer it.

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune, in an excellent editorial on occupational education, has made a meaningful contribution toward the current dialog on preparing young people for gainful employment.

I recommend this editorial to my colleagues for a better understanding of how junior colleges can play a key role in developing a post secondary system of education which will compliment training programs started by youngsters in lower grades to develop marketable skills.

I have said time and again that the basis for our effort to eliminate poverty in America and to prevent phenomena like the Poor People's Campaign in Washington is to develop a system of education in this Nation where every single American youngster will develop a marketable skill in his elementary and secondary education process. The Chicago Tribune's emphasis on postsecondary education fortifies the arguments for a greater emphasis in occupational education.

The Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

EDUCATING FOR JOBS

The Illinois State Chamber of Commerce has just published a survey entitled "Occupational Education in Illinois Public Junior Colleges." This useful brochure spells out in here-and-now terms what our state's rapidly growing junior college system is offering [and has planned for the near future] in terminal courses of study aimed at specific job markets. The showing is extensive, with tremendous potential for further growth. There are 101 different programs listed, from accounting to X-ray technician, from air conditioning to welding. In Illinois there are 34 public junior colleges in being, with more due to open next fall.

Economy and convenience are probably the ideas that junior colleges suggest to most people. Those are powerful considerations, especially for young people with means too limited to permit leaving home or paying high tuitions. But occupational education—qualifying people to hold jobs that call for less than a college degree but more than a high school diploma—is probably the biggest idea involving the junior colleges.

The chamber of commerce states three uses of its new publication—to inform employers of sources of new trained personnel; to inform employers of job-related curricula to which they can direct present employees; and to direct attention to gaps in existing curricula, gaps which business initiative might help fill. It all boils down to matching qualified people with job opportunities. Anything that does that helps not only the businesses and employees directly involved, but everyone.

Junior colleges do such matching. Without neglecting the preparation of students to

transfer successfully to four-year colleges elsewhere, junior colleges should and no doubt will give high priority to occupational education. Their most distinctive and probably most useful contribution is and will be in that kind of teaching.

ANOTHER DR. GODDARD NEEDED

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, upon learning of the resignation of Dr. James L. Goddard, I wrote a letter to the President expressing our disappointment and at the same time recommending for his consideration the appointment of Dr. Herbert Ley, Director of the Bureau of Medicine.

I include my letter in the RECORD at this point and following my letter I insert an editorial from the Fullerton, Calif., Tribune in the RECORD. This editorial expresses the sentiments of many in the medical field regarding Dr. Goddard's work. He will be sorely missed by his colleagues in the Food and Drug Administration as well as by those who worked with him outside the Administration.

The above-mentioned follows:

MAY 22, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We learned with a regret we feel sure will be shared by all well informed citizens of the resignation of Dr. Goddard. That worthy gentleman has served with a distinction that ranks with the most dedicated of a long line of outstanding public servants but beyond that with a courage and dedication matched by only a few.

Dr. Goddard's tenure in office has highlighted the importance of the Food and Drug Administration and its critical position in safeguarding the health and lives of our citizenry. The great record he has established needs to be continued, I am sure you will agree.

May we strongly and sincerely support by our voice and office the recommendation of Dr. Herbert Ley as a new leader with the Goddard spirit. We are informed that Dr. Goddard himself has indicated his support for Dr. Ley and I am sure you are impressed by such confidence far above any such feeling I could hope to inspire.

The public needs and looks for our continued best efforts and closest surveillance in this vital field of government activity. We know you will give the selection of the new Administrator your sober and considered study. We thank you for your kind attention and patience.

Very respectfully,

RICHARD T. HANNA,
Member of Congress.

[From the Fullerton, Calif., Tribune,
May 23, 1968]

ANOTHER DR. GODDARD NEEDED

It is unfortunate for the country, and for the American people, that Dr. James L. Goddard could not see his way clear to remain as commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration.

He has been the strongest, most conscientious and most dedicated chief since the late

Harvey W. Wiley, the "father" and first head of the FDA.

Dr. Goddard correctly interpreted the responsibility of his post as being to safeguard the health of the people to the fullest extent possible. When the inevitable conflicts with vested interests, notably the pharmaceutical manufacturers, occurred, Dr. Goddard stood up and was counted on the side of the public. He put into effect recommendations of the Kefauver Committee, and subsequent congressional investigative bodies, to apply stronger standards in the testing and marketing of new drugs and in measuring the efficacy and safety of others already being dispensed to the public.

Countless lives were saved because of these measures, for looseness and abuse were far too prevalent before Dr. Goddard assumed his office. The tragedies stemming from use of Thalidomide, a tranquilizer that resulted in deformities to unborn children, serve as one example of negligent practices in the department.

We are all in Dr. Goddard's debt. While we deeply regret his decision to return to private life, we wish him well in whatever endeavors he may undertake.

Unanswered at this point is the question of a successor to head the Food and Drug Administration. Because of the extreme importance of the office of commissioner, who must rule on matters of life and death and resist all efforts to exploit the public for monetary gain, the White House should not settle for less than the best-qualified person, a man of caliber comparable to that of Dr. Goddard.

We believe there is such a man in the department's Bureau of Medicine—its director, Dr. Herbert Ley.

We strongly urge his appointment and hope that members of Congress and others who may have influence with the administration will exert it in Dr. Ley's behalf.

TO THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day, May 30, 1968, has a special significance, as we all know, due to the war in Vietnam and the great crisis we face in America and throughout the world. It is refreshing to pick up a newspaper, as I did the Sevier County News Record, published on Memorial Day, and read such a moving tribute to the Unknown Soldier.

The tribute was written by James R. Howard, a 17-year-old senior in the Granite High School in Salt Lake City, Utah, who was among the students chosen to visit Washington, D.C., in January 1968, to observe the work of the U.S. Government. Their visit was sponsored by the William Randolph Hearst Foundation for Youth. After visiting the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, James wrote this tribute which we feel is a remarkable revelation of a depth of perceptive patriotism that is exemplary of true Americanism.

It was carried on the front page of this fine newspaper and the words speak out clearly, as follows:

You lie in your cold grave—triumphant in death because you defeated tyranny, peaceful in death because you died a free man.

And I wonder what tribute can I pay to you—a patriot who loved freedom and country enough to forfeit life and name on a foreign battlefield?

I would thank you—but words of thanks cannot penetrate the grave.

I would weep for you—but tears can neither stir your silent body nor warm your still heart.

I would laugh for you but laughter would disintegrate against the walls of your joyless tomb.

I would comfort you as a brother—but brotherhood cannot surmount the obstacle of eternity.

I would show you the free land you helped to save—but your vision is blocked by the curtain of death.

So I will offer you the one tribute which makes your death meaningful and my life worthwhile. I will honor your memory by pledging myself to the perpetuation of those ideals for which you fought and died—the defense of freedom, the love of liberty, and a peaceful future.

Thus will your death enrich my life, thus will my actions honor your unknown name.

—JAMES R. HOWARD.

IMPROVED STREET LIGHTING DETERS CRIME

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, life in my own community is encapsulated in fear for life, limb, and property because of the rising incidence of crime. This is true of communities throughout the Nation. Improved street lighting can serve as an effective deterrent to crime by eliminating the dark and the shadows which provide cover and concealment for the criminal element. The Flatbush Chamber of Commerce in my district has taken leadership in programs to improve municipal street lighting systems. As a guide to other civic organizations, I am calling attention to the text of a resolution on this subject adopted by the Flatbush Chamber of Commerce and addressed to responsible officials of New York City. The text of the resolution follows:

We are very much distressed to read the latest report issued by the Police Department on the increase of major crimes. In our city, in fact throughout the state, the problem of crime prevention and enforcement of law are becoming more and more exacting.

The members of the Board of Directors, after an extensive study, respectfully want to present for your consideration, some changes in our street lighting system to improve street conditions, to illuminate the dark area where crime is most likely to be rampant at night.

The present city law requires outside lights at each entrance to large buildings, but these lights do not extend further than the immediate entrance. There are at present many areas of one and two family homes that do not come under this category. We believe that lights deter crime. The thug, the robber, the rapist, shrink from the glare of bright street lights. Thefts of motor vehicles showed the highest rate increase.

The present street lighting system consists, in most instances, of 30 foot high street lighting standards, usually 120 to 160 feet on

centers, complete with a bracket arm assembly to support a mercury vapor type luminaire. Nothing but spill light is available for the sidewalk area adjoining the street, with the result that most streets in the city are dark and dismal, creating an atmosphere ideal for muggers and rapists.

To correct this hazardous condition, we are outlining the following three ideas for your consideration to improve our lighting system:

(a) Equip each of the present street lighting standards with an additional bracket arm assembly and luminaire, similar to the one presently installed and located on poles 180 degrees from the present luminaire. This additional luminaire will provide adequate illumination for the sidewalk area directly under and on either side of the street lighting standard.

(b) Equip each of the present street lighting standards with twin mercury vapor floodlight assemblies mounted on top of the pole. These pole mounted floodlights should, of necessity, be placed back to back with their floodlight beams directed towards and parallel to the sidewalk below to provide the required illumination. This scheme is presently being utilized by the Street Lighting Division of the Department of Water Supply, Gas and Electricity of the City of New York to illuminate public schools and Park Department playgrounds that adjoin city streets.

(c) Change the distribution of illumination of the present street lighting luminaires to a distribution, which will redirect some of the light from the luminaire to the adjoining sidewalk and at the same time provide illumination for the street. This change in type of distribution can be accomplished by a simple adjustment of the adjustable lamp socket within the luminaire, without necessity of replacing the refractor lens. It is true that the amount of illumination in the street will be reduced, and it is for this reason we strongly recommend that, if at all possible, the present 400-watt luminaires be replaced with their 1,000-watt companion versions. This proposed 1,000-watt luminaire will provide adequate illumination for the street as well as the adjoining sidewalks.

It is our feeling that scheme (c) is the most beneficial as well as the most economical of the three ideas proposed. However, due to the fact that certain locations of the city require the selection of various lighting equipment, we leave this matter to the best judgment of our city engineers to improve the present performance of our street lighting system.

We ask your response to this expression of our observation, approved by the unanimous vote of our Board of Directors, and hope you can give us some indication of what steps, if any, you advise will be taken on your part to cure this unsatisfactory condition and improve the street lighting system.

A TIME FOR CONFIDENCE, NOT WORRY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of all of the black pictures painted recently of the state of our national economy which have led to the pushing of the panic button demonstrated most recently by the actions of the conference committee in tying the proposed surtax to a \$6 billion reduction in the President's current budget, I felt that an article written by Prof. J. Philip

Wernette deserves our most serious consideration and study.

Professor Wernette feels that the U.S. economy is strong and is critical of many of the "scare statements" we have been reading. He feels that the budget deficit is bad, but that it is not of crisis proportions. Inflation resulting from the present economic situation is not good, but "the harm done by it is grossly exaggerated."

He also points out that the surtax would have an impact in controlling this inflation, but not the impact it is credited with having. In fact, he sees a possible danger in the actions we are now contemplating, stating:

"Reducing both deficits—budgetary and in the balance of payments—may be desirable; but actions to accomplish these goals are quite as likely to retard American prosperity as to preserve it.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point, I include the article, which was carried in the Los Angeles Times, on May 29, 1968. Professor Wernette is an economist in the Graduate School of Business Administration at the University of Michigan and editor of the Michigan Business Review. His books include "The Future of American Prosperity" and "Government and Business."

The article follows:

A TIME FOR CONFIDENCE, NOT WORRY

(By J. Philip Wernette)

The American people are being bombarded with scare statements about the balance of payments and the gold crisis, warning that the U.S. economy is in bad shape and unless quick corrective action is taken disaster threatens.

In fact, the American economy is in excellent shape and is getting better right along. Here are some of these statements:

A European international banker says, "What you have is a severe dollar hemorrhage and it could bleed you to death." He does not go on to explain how a nation can be bled to death, but he makes it sound bad.

A noted columnist states, "This gold outflow, if continued, could shatter our economy." One can understand what it means to shatter a glass, but what does the term "shatter our economy" mean?

A staff correspondent for a noted newspaper writes, "When the gold crisis subsides, there will remain one overriding question: Will the United States, the greatest world power, have the strength and courage to put its economic house in order? That house is in disorder now." The writer did not go on to explain the forms of disorder—perhaps because he would have found it hard or impossible to do so.

"A sound dollar is vital to the defense of our country; and ours is shaky." No; a strong economy is vital; and ours is strong.

LOOK AT TRUE INDICATORS

What are the facts? What are the measures of the strength and soundness of a nation's economy? There are several, and the United States scores well on all of them.

1. Productivity (as commonly measured by output per manhour) is high and rising.
2. Employment is high and rising and unemployment is at a relatively low level.
3. The real gross national product (streams of goods and services produced by the American people) is at an all-time high and is rising.
4. Capital investment is at an all-time high and is rising.
5. The state of technology and business management skill and enterprise are also at all-time high levels and are rising.

6. Average real family incomes are in the same happy condition.

The foregoing are the key measures and they indicate that the performance of the American economy is the best of any nation in the world.

In the face of this evidence, what conditions lend support to the scare statements about the economy being in disorder?

One is that the commodity price level is at an all-time high and is rising. This rise is inflation, which is not good; but the harm done by it is grossly exaggerated.

Another is the fact that the budget of the federal government is unbalanced and is showing the largest deficit ever registered in peace time. That deficit is about one-fortieth of the gross national product. By contrast, in 1944, during World War II, the deficit was more than one-fifth of the gross national product. That condition, of course, was nothing to evoke enthusiasm, but on the other hand, it did not seem to generate the fearful statements that today's relatively much smaller deficit does.

The other factors that disturb the worried observers are the interrelated ones of the deficit in our international balance of payments and the gold outflow. Our monetary gold stock has gone down in the last 10 years from \$23 billion to \$10 billion. Since we do not have an unlimited supply, the danger is that we may run out or be forced to suspend gold payments before our stock is entirely exhausted.

It is because of this condition that foreigners have urged or have even demanded that the United States take steps to improve its balance of payments position. The step most commonly urged is moving nearer toward a balance in the federal budget—a move which is approved by foreign central bankers either because of its believed innate virtue or because of its believed effect on inflation in the United States and on our balance of payments. The reasoning is that by restraining the rise in aggregate demand, inflation would be checked and exports stimulated, and, by reducing American markets, imports would be reduced.

The price of this kind of policy probably would be increased unemployment. Furthermore, these conditions would be hurtful to the very foreign countries whose experts are urging them, would probably lead to retaliatory actions, and might not affect the balance of payments very much.

In an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington on April 19, William McChesney Martin, Jr., the highly respected chairman of the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System, said:

"The nation is in the midst of the worst financial crisis since 1931. In 1931, the problem was deflation. Today, it is inflation and equally intolerable....

"I hope I am not being too emotional about our situation, but we are faced with an intolerable budget deficit and also an intolerable deficit in our international balance of payments.

"Both have to be corrected over the next few years or the United States is going to face either an uncontrollable recession or an uncontrollable inflation. We ought to get to work on these problems immediately."

In evaluating any public speech by Chairman Martin, it is wise to bear in mind that this honorable and patriotic man, by virtue of his position, is required to make certain positive statements. He must assert in the strongest terms the American determination to honor its gold obligations, not to increase the mint price of gold, and to achieve a proper balance of payments.

Moreover, in order to lend substance to this statement of determination, he must refer to the steps considered to be necessary and to indicate why failure to take these steps and to achieve these goals would be extremely harmful to the American economy.

If he does not make such statements,

foreigners might interpret his stand as being less than reassuring and thereupon withdraw more monetary gold. In short, his statements are a protection for our gold stock.

When, however, his statements are subjected to economic analysis, neither facts nor reasoning support them. Our economic situation today is not at all comparable to our situation in 1931 and any suggestion that, unless the steps Martin recommends are taken, the sequence of events in the next few years in our country will resemble those that followed 1931 is completely wrong. Such inaction would not lead to an uncontrollable recession; indeed, it is doubtful that it would lead to even a small recession.

Nor, if they are not taken, do we face an uncontrollable inflation. The impact of the pending surtax on inflation in the United States is being grossly exaggerated. It will not make the difference between no inflation and an uncontrollable inflation. In fact, in the next year, it probably would make the difference between a 4% inflation and a 3% inflation.

OTHER NOTABLE LACKS

It may also be noted that Chairman Martin said nothing about the expansionary monetary policy followed by the Federal Reserve System last year, when the Fed permitted the fastest expansion of the national money stock since World War II—at a rate very considerably in excess of our normal growth needs and probably a more expansionary force than the rise in federal expenditures during the same period.

The case for scrutinizing federal expenditures was made in a calm and sensible fashion last autumn by House Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills, when he observed that, wholly apart from the present problems, it is time for us to take a hard look at the size of the federal government and its role in our lives.

Reducing both deficits—budgetary and in the balance of payments—may be desirable; but actions to accomplish these goals are quite as likely to retard American prosperity as to preserve it.

The fact is that every significant indicator shows that the American economy is strong. Employment, industrial production, the real gross national product, and our standard of living—every one is at an all-time high. Moreover, the outlook for continued growth is favorable.

The strength of the American economy depends on what goes on within our borders, not on what goes out across them and what is going on within our borders is strong and getting stronger. This is a time for justified confidence, not for worrisome fear.

ITALIAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join in saluting the citizens of Italy on the happy occasion of Italian National Day. There is reason for pride and satisfaction in the unprecedented progress made by the Italian Republic since its birth 22 years ago.

On June 2, 1946, the people of Italy held their first election following World War II and voted to replace their monarchy with a republican form of government.

Italy thus began the difficult road back to cultural and political importance in the world. Her land was ravaged by the war and threatened by an expanding and well-organized Communist Party eager

to subvert the country. Nevertheless, since that time Italy has undergone a second renaissance. A modern industrial sector has been established, democratic institutions have taken firm root, a stable government has prevailed, the underdeveloped south is being brought into the mainstream of Italian life, and Italy serves as a loyal and strong link in the Atlantic Alliance.

Italy's prosperity is due to the vigor and determination of the Italian people. With an early boost from the United States, they have worked hard to bring their country to its present state of economic and political well-being.

Of course, the vigor and determination of the citizens of Italy come as no surprise to Americans. We have been enriched beyond measure by the immigration of millions of Italians to our shores throughout our history. From pre-Revolutionary times to the present day, the industry, vitality, and artistry of Italian-Americans have contributed greatly to our national life. On behalf of Americans of Italian descent and of all Americans I am proud to extend best wishes for continued growth and prosperity to the people of Italy on this their Republic's 22d anniversary.

COLUMNIST SYLVIA PORTER ANALYZES THE NEW CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION ACT

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the Members of the House of Representatives an excellent article in the Washington Star and in the many other newspapers which carry this outstanding feature, by Sylvia Porter, columnist on economic issues for the Publishers-Hall syndicate, on Public Law 90-321, the Consumer Credit Protection Act signed last Wednesday by President Johnson.

Miss Porter points to the many far-reaching provisions of the law on disclosure of finance charges, on garnishment, on loan-sharking, on second mortgage rackets, and on the title of the law creating the National Commission on Consumer Finance.

But she also points with sharp clarity to some of the compromises which had to be made in the House bill in getting the final version of the legislation through conference. We should all be aware of the shortcomings as well as of the strengths of the new law. As I told Miss Porter when she was preparing this column, the new law—far reaching as it is—is no cure-all for all of the ills of the marketplace; it is only a good beginning.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Star, June 3, 1968]

TRUTH IN LENDING LAW IS HAILED

(By Sylvia Porter)

The Consumer Credit Protection Act signed last week by President Johnson is one of the

most important of all consumer protection laws.

The law will, for the first time, force lenders to disclose, both in dollars and in yearly percentages, the actual cost of borrowing money. Thus it will compel lenders to provide borrowers with means of comparing a variety of terms. It will reveal, beginning July 1, 1969, that many "6 percent" auto loans actually are double that rate; that a monthly credit charge of 1½ percent adds up to 18 percent a year; that in some cases, small loans by consumer loan companies are costing 30 percent a year.

But there are other less publicized, little noticed aspects of the new law which may equal or dwarf its interest disclosure provisions in their importance to consumers.

1. The law, for example, will prohibit garnishment of wages up to \$48 a week and also will prohibit employers from automatically firing an employee whose wages have been garnished for the first time.

This provision could be a crippling blow to the vicious credit peddler who lends to the poorest risks not on the basis of their ability to repay but because the borrower's wages are garnishable. It also could save thousands of borrowers from personal bankruptcy resulting directly from the current medieval wage garnishment procedures.

2. The law also will forbid loan sharks from charging interest rates exceeding 45 percent a year and also will forbid them from collecting their debts by violent means. Loan sharking business, dominated by organized crime, in which interest rates of 1,000 percent or more a year are often charged. It's estimated that loan sharks today are bilking the poor of \$350,000,000 a year. The significance of the nation's first Federal crackdown on this magnitude of usury can hardly be exaggerated.

3. The law clamps down on unscrupulous home repair racketeers who lure homeowners into unwittingly signing second mortgages on their homes, while they think they are signing ordinary installment loan contracts. It does this by providing for a three-day "cooling off" period during which the homeowner may back out of a deal and by requiring home repair firms to explain clearly what's involved in a second mortgage.

4. Finally, the law provides for a new National Commission on Consumer Finance which, in the words of Rep. Wright Patman, D-Tex., chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, "may well be the greatest accomplishment of the bill." The Commission will probe every aspect of consumer credit in the United States today and surely will make recommendations for further legislation.

Tough as the landmark Truth in Lending law is, pressure already is building up to make it even tougher, through future amendments.

Still exempt from Federal control are the installment lenders who get around the high interest rate problem simply by doubling the prices on goods being sold to the poor or who pile on every manner of special finance charge when they draw up a loan contract. Lenders still do not have to spell out the total dollar cost of a first mortgage to a homebuyer, even though this cost sometimes equals the cost of the home itself. Department stores and other retailers still do not have to spell out yearly interest rates on charge account balances of \$35 or less if the credit charge is 50c or less a month, even though this can amount to a yearly interest rate of 17 per cent.

The protection for which former Sen. Paul Douglas of Illinois fought so hard and long is at last law. But says Rep. Leonor K. Sullivan, D-Mo., the law-maker who brought it to fruition in its current tough form, "It is no cure-all for all the ills of the marketplace. It's only a good beginning."

MEMORIAL DAY OBSERVANCE ADDRESS

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day, May 30, 1968, Alfred F. Caccamo, the second district vice commander of the American Legion, gave a Memorial Day observance address to Brooklyn Post 500 of the American Legion. I thought Mr. Caccamo's speech was particularly significant, and I include the text of that speech for the benefit of my colleagues:

MEMORIAL DAY OBSERVANCE ADDRESS OF ALFRED F. CACCAMO, MAY 30, 1968

This is Memorial Day 1968, a patriotic holiday in the United States. A holiday marked traditionally by parades—memorial services—and decorating of graves with flowers and flags.

This is Memorial Day 1968, dedicated to the memory of the dead of all wars, a day we honor the soldiers and sailors and a day we honor the memory of all those who have died.

This is Memorial Day 1968, first observed officially one hundred years ago today on May 30, 1868 by order of General John A. Logan, Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic. This memorable order which gave the greatest momentum for establishing a national holiday in tribute to this Nation's heroic dead.

Mr. Toastmaster, Commander, distinguished guests on the Dais, officers and members of the Brooklyn 500 Post, Members of the Auxiliaries, my fellow legionnaires and friends.

I am honored to have this opportunity to talk to you on this day Brooklyn 500 Post conducts memorial services for all who have answered the final call.

Memorial services are of special significance to the American Legion and its members who served and proudly so in all the major wars of our time. While born in war, the American Legion, largest of all veterans' organizations, labors for peace. An honorable and durable peace for all America.

As we salute the hero dead of all wars and honor all others who held to mould American character apart from military service, I want to tell you about some of the fundamental principles of the American Legion.

We believe these principals are sound. They should live in the hearts of all Americans. For in the final analysis it is hard to distinguish between the true goals of the American Legion and those of America.

Preservation of the rich American heritage for which we fought is a goal to which the American Legion is dedicated. We realize, of course that this goal is impossible unless the people of America are convinced of the value of that heritage.

We believe it necessary for all of us—to remind ourselves constantly of the ancient values upon which our government and entire way of life are founded.

Freedom does not perpetuate itself, but has to be won anew by each generation. This means that every generation must be always prepared to place upon the altar of freedom the sacrifices that freedom demands. What we are is good. But it will only be that way as long as we are free.

Patriotism is a basic ideal of the American Legion. Love of country, we believe, is a virtue, and one that must be visible demonstrated. Since the flag is a symbol of our nation, we believe that visible respect must be shown it. The flag stands for all that is

good and noble about our rich heritage. When we respect it, we are indicating to the world that we revere our heritage and love the country that has given it to us.

The American Legion hates war. But we believe the best way to avoid war is to be prepared militarily and morally. And—through public opinion, let the world know that we Americans today are just as willing to fight for our freedoms today as were our heroes past. Willingness to bear arms in defense of our country is a prime responsibility of citizenship. This cannot be denied, it cannot be shirked when the occasion demands.

War is fearful and costly in terms of human suffering and material losses. But it is also true that life without freedom is meaningless and in the end not worth living.

History teaches the bitter lesson that the nation that would not fight for its freedom soon lost it. Nation's character and identity are lost when freedom is lost.

What we Americans decide to do today, about our country and about the world in which we live may well decide not only *how* but *whether* the youth of America will live tomorrow.

Today—our most urgent requirement is national unity. Demonstrations, criticism, and arguments that cast doubt on our motives and tear down our national spirit have no place in the discussion of problems we face. All of us recognize the inalienable right of every citizen to petition and to peaceable demonstration on behalf of the cause which he supports. We also recognize the difference between rights and riots. It is identical to the difference between liberty and license, and the right to protest does not give license to engage in campaigns, demonstrations or even arguments that lend aid and comfort to the very enemy who today is killing our fighting men in a bloody war halfway around the world. The time has passed when it was useful to argue whether, and to what extent, we should have become involved in Vietnam. *We are there.* Thousands of our men have made the supreme sacrifice and thousands more have been wounded . . . some of them marked for life by the scars of the conflict. This is no "limited" war to them. Having committed American military men to battle, the American Government and every citizen of our United States is totally committed to their full support. Vietnam is a test of both our power and our strength of national purpose and determination. The battle is therefore being fought inside the United States as much as on the battlefields of Vietnam.

There are lessons to be learned from history and we should have learned by now that appeasement of aggression leads only to further aggression. Those who would have us pull out of Vietnam have forgotten the lesson of Munich. We had better remember that lesson, for to abandon the conflict in Vietnam can only bring another confrontation with communism at another time and in another place.

Our job as Americans, each of us, is to see that our hope never darkens, that our Nation will stand great and strong and generous . . . able to offer a helping hand to all who need it. Just as we have done since World War II.

In closing remember we must all work together for God and country and in doing so, we will be keeping faith with all the heroes in our Nation's past.

Comrades and friends, on this Memorial Day let us pledge ourselves anew to patriotic service. Let us make ourselves the friend and brother, son and father, of those who will not see their own again in mortal flesh. Let us grasp with fearless hands the flag so nobly borne before, and, like those others, plant it always on the battlements of righteousness.

Thank you.

JAPAN BOYCOTTS THE STATE OF ISRAEL

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I find it necessary to bring to the attention of my colleagues a distasteful situation which seems to be intensifying with each passing month; namely, the economic boycott of the State of Israel by Japan.

Three reactions strike me immediately.

The first is the distaste that a major maritime and trading nation should find it necessary to bow to the pressure of the Arab boycott against the State of Israel.

The second is the uselessness of the Japanese decision, inasmuch as the other maritime and trading nations of the world which have refused to bow to international blackmail are still buying Arab oil; and it appears to be the fear of this source which has been the determining factor in the Japanese acquiescence in obeying the Arab dictum neither to buy from Israel nor sell her that which she wishes to buy.

The third is the brutal hypocrisy of a Japan trading with United States and Nationalist China the same time it is trading with Red China; trading with both North and South Korea at the same time; the hypocrisy of a nation screaming loudly for free and unrestricted international trade turning against little Israel.

All these facts and many more are present in a report issued by the Anti-defamation League of B'nai B'rith. I consider the 25-page report too lengthy for insertion in its entirety, but I recommend the reading of it to any of my colleagues who are interested in international fairplay.

Israel is anxious to trade with Japan; they are a natural combination with Israel ready to supply such raw materials as phosphates, alkali, cement, diamonds, and so forth, in addition to varied foodstuffs.

Israel is an eager market for Japan's electrical and automotive goods, finished and knocked down machinery and consumer products.

Israel had also negotiated with the Kawasaki Dockyard Co., of Kobe, to build for its merchant fleet a 100,000-ton oil tanker. In a letter to Zim Israel Navigation Co., the prospective purchaser, the Japanese builder stated:

One of the Kawasaki Group Company has a business transaction with the U.A.R. which fact was not made known to us at the time of our early negotiation with you for this deal.

However, this fact has been recently put before us at a consultation meeting of the Kawasaki Group and at that meeting the said company has strongly made his appeal to us that we discontinue this particular business for Israel.

Under the above circumstances, we, all of a sudden, are compelled to put forward this declaration to you with a thousand pities and this matter will trouble our conscience for your very kind assistance made in negotiating this deal to date.

Please understand our position and accept our deep apology for this unhappy situation.

Taking this opportunity, we wish to add that this action has no bearing with the Japanese government and we never received their instruction nor suggestion and the decision made by us is purely based on our discretion.

Mr. Speaker, there is a letter from the Shiba Electric Co., Ltd., of Tokyo, to an Israel importer who wished to buy closed circuit television.

The letter states simply that—

To our regret, we wish to refrain from quoting the article, because our company have closely dealt with Arabic countries.

There are other letters as well.

Trade between the two nations is not completely nil, but it is descending to a point where it will be soon. In 1966, Israel exported \$13.5 million in goods to Japan—but of this \$12 million was diamonds alone. The remaining \$1.5 million in other goods represents a decline from \$5.7 million during the previous year.

The position of the Congress is quite clear. In a 1965 amendment to the export control bill of 1949, the Congress went on record as opposing "restrictive trade practices or boycotts by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States."

This is a classic example of what the Congress opposes.

It much be remembered that the United States is Japan's best customer. In 1966, the United States absorbed \$2.969 billion worth of Japanese imports. The United States has an unbalanced trade with Japan, with Japan getting the advantage; and this advantage is growing annually.

I think the time has come for the Congress of the United States, for the people of the United States, and the businessmen of the United States to tell the Government and industrialists of Japan that we mean what we say and we say what we mean.

STEEL IMPORT CONTROLS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means began hearings today on the important issue of the balance of trade between the United States and foreign nations.

These hearings, according to the committee, will be comprehensive and will consider the whole pattern of tariff and trade proposals which have been made over recent months.

Included is the very important issue of the increasing influx of foreign steel into the United States.

I introduced legislation—H.R. 14295—last fall to provide for orderly trade in iron ore, iron, and steel mill products. This measure has wide support, as evidenced by the large amount of mail which I have received before and since I sponsored the legislation.

Two weeks ago, the Lackawanna Chamber of Commerce adopted the following resolution which refers to H.R. 13543. I also cosponsored that measure,

but my H.R. 14295 represents a refinement of the earlier bill.

The resolution referred to follows:

LACKAWANNA RESOLUTION

Whereas the Lackawanna Chamber of Commerce is a businessman's organization in the Steel City of the Great Lakes—Lackawanna, New York; and

Whereas the commercial health of our community is directly dependent upon full employment of our citizens, many of whom are employed at the Bethlehem Steel Corporation's Lackawanna Plant, situated within our Corporate limits; and

Whereas the Lackawanna Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors are convinced that the rapidly increasing use of foreign made steel in this country is becoming a depressant to needed improvements and expansion of our domestic steel industry; and

Whereas the unchecked increase, in future years, of foreign steel imports may well decrease the demand for domestic steel and thereby reduce the employment of American labor in American steel mills

Now therefore be it resolved, That the Lackawanna Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors petition the New York State Senators and the area Congressmen to move and pass S. 2537 and H.R. 13543 respectively and that a copy of this resolution be furnished each legislator signifying the very strong feelings of the petitioners.

Unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Lackawanna Chamber of Commerce held May 22, 1968.

MODERNIZING MEDICAL CARE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I was honored twice during May with invitations to address groups of doctors and medical educators.

Although each meeting was devoted, in part, to the new advances in the technology of medical education, I chose to consider some of the broader issues of medical care and the responsibilities of the medical schools for changing our medical care system.

Because these speeches aroused strong feelings about our medical care system—I am still answering letters of praise and criticism about them—I am including the texts which I hope will interest my colleagues as we prepare to face the difficult task of the proper Federal response to the serious shortcomings in our medical care system.

SPEECH BEFORE THE AMERICAN FEDERATION FOR CLINICAL RESEARCH, ATLANTIC CITY, MAY 4, 1968

A layman should be reverent before the dramatic communications changes described today which may soon make medicine more efficient and more effective. But I'm not.

Medicine is for people and by people and it won't be improved from its present sorry state in this country until we do something about the people running it.

I am not proposing to shock you with a populist speech from your proper attention to the new electronics. But I do not think you should return to your universities and your medical schools without refreshing your human response to the unfair, discriminatory and over-rated system of American medicine which so awkwardly today faces

its responsibilities to a society to which it is so essentially alien.

I talk to many people, and listen to even more, about your profession and its practice. I find no one who is happy with it and few who even make a good defense of it.

I'm not speaking of the poor, the ignorant, and victims of discrimination. They never had any happy experience with doctors. I am speaking of representatives of the middle class, whom I represent in Congress and whom you serve, directly or indirectly.

Americans have been educated to accept their doctors and their medical services as the best in the world. Obvious discrepancies between this institutional advertising and one's personal experiences were usually dismissed as exceptions. There was until recently an isolation from comparisons with other countries which is now shattered by the frequency with which doctors themselves discuss our persistently inferior ratings in the crucial health indices: infant mortality, maternal mortality, and life expectancy.

America ranks 21st among nations in life expectancy at birth for males. We are behind such nations as Malta, France and Spain, and significantly farther behind such medically-advanced countries as Denmark, Netherlands, and Sweden.

Our infant mortality rate is 18th among countries reported by the World Health Organization. Statistically, we could save over 40,000 young lives a year if we matched the health record of the Netherlands.

These national averages, by their statistical nature, smother an even more damaging indictment: our medical services for the poor, for the Negro, and for the rural residents are much below these mediocre national averages.

These great social and geographical disparities mean that metropolitan middle-class residents, disturbed and annoyed by overcrowded waiting rooms, delayed medical appointments, assembly line examining and diagnosis techniques and treatment are relatively well-off compared to the simple lack of doctors and basic medical facilities endured by the urban poor and by almost any rural residential group.

The President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty just reported that "We have failed miserably to protect the health of low-income people in rural areas. The health service they get is not only inadequate in extent but seriously deficient in quality. It is badly organized, under-financed, rarely related to the needs of the individual or the family".

That commission's jurisdiction was limited to the rural poor; its comment on your profession applies here to a far wider group.

For among non-whites throughout the country, the picture is indeed bleak. Maternal mortality, related directly, of course, to pre-natal care, is four times as high for non-whites as for whites. Infant mortality is an equally dismal prospect for black babies. Over 40 out of every 1000 non-white babies dies before the age of 12 months, compared to about 21 white infants.

How does the richest nation in the history of the world tolerate these conditions? The Medical Establishment, represented by the private practice of doctor-oriented medicine and walking hand-in-hand with the research-oriented federal government, is only somewhat and sometimes concerned about these problems.

President Milford O. Rouse, of the American Medical Association, said at his inauguration last June:

"We are faced with many problems and many challenges. We are faced with the concept of health care as a right rather than a privilege.

"Several major steps have already been taken by the federal government in providing health and medical care for large segments of the population. Other steps have

been proposed. These we must continue to oppose.

"What is our philosophy? It is the faith in private enterprise. We can, therefore, concentrate our attention on the single obligation to protect the American way of life. That way can be described in one word: Capitalism."

He concluded, "The United States (has) a quality of health care unsurpassed anywhere."

Private enterprise, in Dr. Rouse's context, suggests health service should center around the private practitioner of medicine. I believe that health service must be oriented to the patient. Our criteria of good medical services should be not the self-defensive statements of the AMA President, but the accepted medical indices, like infant and maternal mortality and life expectancy. And when these indices show serious deficiencies of medical care, as they unquestionably do now, the answer is not "more of the same," but rather a complete and thoughtful evaluation of our national medical services.

It is in this context that I see, with many distinguished doctors and medical educators, a crisis in America's medical services. And it will not do to dismiss Dr. Rouse as an atypical American doctor. I am really not concerned about Dr. Rouse but only about the climate in American medicine which produces him. One does not become President of the AMA without reflecting accurately the convictions of many of its 215,000 members.

If we admit that the situation in medical services is serious today, how prepared are you men, who will lead academic medicine for the next 20 or 30 years, to revise the present system?

Are you ready, for example, to admit that much of the private practitioner's time today is wasted, whether measured in terms of directing his attention to those really needing his skilled services within his middle class practice or by the standards of infant and maternal mortality I have mentioned, which show that the poor and the ignorant simply fall, by the system you work in and reinforce, to get the minimum medical care they deserve?

American medicine is today a middle class service institution run by well-to-do doctors for their own convenience and profit. This is a minority view, which is certainly not typical of my Congressional colleagues, but it will become more prevalent in the future.

To see these problems from a different perspective, imagine a discussion two hundred years ago about the state of American education.

Imagine a system of education characterized by private teachers, working for fee-for-service, in their own offices and other purely private institutions.

Imagine: little interest or activity by the government directed to improving the education system.

Imagine: no credence for the belief that education is not only a right of the citizen but a primary responsibility of government.

And, finally, imagine: grossly inadequate performance of the educational system, as indicated by wide illiteracy, ignorance of public issues, and governmental distrust of public opinion.

Mid-eighteenth century America was actually like this. Change medicine for education, and this sketch becomes an accurate view of how 20th Century America practices private medicine.

What then happened to private education in America? Well, it still exists at some of your schools and at a relatively few primary and secondary schools, but the last 200 years has seen the construction of the American public education system.

Do you think private teachers in America in 1768 could imagine public schools as a right? Can doctors today imagine public medical care as a right? My guess is that

American medicine will undergo a change as fundamental as that experienced by American education. It will take about 20 years.

How can you—the leaders of academic medicine—accept this challenge and prepare a proper response? How can Congress and the rest of the federal government anticipate this change, encourage its development, and yet retain the essential nature of medicine as a system for the best exercise of those essentially personal judgments, made in privacy, of humans about the health needs of other humans?

I suggest that one important goal for your medical schools is to take more responsibility for revising the medical educational system than you have ever been inclined to take.

How well are you and your schools prepared to train new kinds of doctors and new kinds of doctors assistants? How important is preventive medicine in your schools today? How many of you have worked to free your colleagues who are pediatricians or obstetricians or orthopedists from the drudgery of their work which takes so much of their time, uses so little of their training, and wastes so much of their medical talents?

You are all aware of the work of Drs. Stead in Duke University and Niebauer in San Francisco and Lewis in Kansas City. Each of these medical educators is trying, in different ways, to train medical assistants to remove some of this drudgery.

Each of them is 20 years behind his time in this training compared to other countries. By present rates of progress, these men are 20 years ahead of your own interest in paramedical personnel.

Each of these is trying to answer the questions:

"Do you need a doctor to take your blood pressure?"

"Can a bright college graduate be taught to take a complete medical history and to give a thorough physical examination?"

"What happens to the medical knowledge of an Army 'medic' when he is discharged?"

These and other similar questions raise one of the most striking questions in American medicine today: How much medical talent are we wasting?

To put the problem in terms of the doctors themselves, let's ask—Is it sensible to train a pediatrician for four years in college, four years in medical school and four years graduate medical training, and then use him for tasks a good junior college graduate can do?

Dr. Bergman's study¹ in the State of Washington showed that pediatricians, especially for the middle and upper classes, have become the "arbiter in the American scene of such things as infant feeding, clothing, elimination, child-rearing practices and the differential diagnosis and treatment of common infectious diseases."

The authors of this study noted that "pediatricians spend most of their time dealing with children who are not ill or have only minor illnesses and who, they may feel, do not require their special talents". The result is intellectual disenchantment, a well-known and serious problem for pediatricians.

We have tens of thousands of babies dying each year because their mothers had poor care or no medical care at all before delivery. Yet, nearby, we have pediatricians serving the middle class who are bored with their work because it could be done by others with much less training.

I am well aware of the problems we face in creating new assistants for today's physician. These problems can be grouped as follows:

- I. Acceptance by doctors.
- II. Acceptance by patients.
- III. Accreditation and licensing.

¹ "Time-Motion Study of Practicing Pediatricians", *Pediatrics*, August, 1966.

IV. Training facilities and methods.

V. Federal encouragement.

Dr. Joseph Stokes, a former dean of the University of California Medical School, has proposed a new graduate degree of "Medical Practice" to prepare one kind of physicians assistant. With four years of post-college medical training (including a one year "apprenticeship" instead of three-five years post-graduate training required for doctors presently), this Medical Practitioner could work principally on salary, either in a hospital or a doctor's office. He would earn more than nurses (\$12,000 to \$15,000) but less than doctors. He "would actually spend 75 to 80 percent of his time performing services now performed by physicians (routine physical examinations, well-child care, operating room assistance and normal deliveries of babies) while 20 to 25 percent of his time would go to carry out tasks now done by certain nurses".²

On patient acceptance, Dr. Stokes concludes:

"Success or failure for such a program would almost certainly rest with the public. It is clear that society is not willing to accept anything but the best where health is concerned. As customers we may be willing to deal with a salesgirl rather than with the department store manager when buying stockings, but for any illness we have thought it best to start at the top. In reality, medical care has much in common with service industries. Each need of each patient should seek its own level of competence. The physician should be allowed to restrict his personal involvement to that for which his superb training uniquely qualifies him. Only in this way will he be able to assume the team leadership role which, as yet, he has been neither willing nor able to accept."

To succeed, a new "Medical Practice" degree would need the following send off:

(1) Agreement by 4-6 medical schools on a curriculum, entrance requirements and simultaneous starting dates.

(2) Accreditation and licensing of the first graduates of these schools in some major populous states—like New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, etc.

(3) Clear understanding by all—including licensing authorities—that practitioners will work within professional guidelines established by physicians who remain legally and in the public's view, as "the ultimate agent of society".

In each of these steps, the medical educators will play a crucial role.

One problem today is that no one knows how to train a physician's assistant. No one knew 30 years ago how to train a television technician either. We need more pilot programs of the kind Duke University and a few other institutions are attempting.

Yet the Duke program³ was financed by a private foundation, partly because neither state nor federal funds were available for a non-degree program but also because there is considerable opposition among the conservative doctors which state and federal agencies deal with on many other medical programs and who are strongly opposed to Dr. Stead's experiment.

Another interesting pilot program for doctor's assistants was carried out in Kansas City using nurses who were given greater responsibilities for patient care.⁴

This program was significant particularly because it focused on patient acceptance of a doctor-substitute.

Clinical patients were divided into two

² "A New Profession Within Medicine?", *Saturday Review*, December 3, 1966.

³ "The Duke Plan for Physician's Assistants", by Dr. Eugene A. Stead, Jr., *Medical Times*, January 1967.

⁴ "Nurse, Clinics, and Ambulatory Patient Care", by Charles E. Lewis, M.D., and Barbara A. Resnik, R.N., *New England Journal of Medicine*, December 7, 1967.

groups—control and experimental. The control group continued to see doctors in the medical clinic. The experimental group saw nurses as the primary source of medical care. All patients were adults with chronic illnesses.

No special training was given the nurses who were, however, willing and very able volunteers for the program.

Here is the striking result of a survey of patient attitudes before and after the 12 month program:

"The majority of patients, at the start, held rather strong opinions about having physicians perform most of the functions associated with medical care . . . patients had many complaints and made frequent use of clinic facilities.

" . . . a year later retesting of the control group revealed no changes. In the experimental group several significant changes were evident. The nurse was accepted as a primary source of care. There was increased adherence to appointed schedules and better utilization of time . . . The overall cost of the program was lower. The experimental group shifted their preference in favor of the nurse as a provider of many of the services formerly reserved for the physician. The quality of care and patient satisfaction with care were high in the experimental group."⁵

Imagine how much better clinical care could be given by specially trained physician's assistants with the credentials, experience, and pride of other professions.

The desperate shortage of health manpower, and the need for new approaches to the traditional medical team, renders these few pilot programs inexcusably inadequate.

And the blame can be divided between the federal government and the medical profession. In any group of human beings most will prefer the status quo. Any disruption of the comfortable complacent and self-justifying present is dangerous.

Most doctors don't think they need a new kind of assistant. Most can not imagine a non-doctor doing things they now do. But a few "heroes" arise in any group of 200,000 members. And the medical profession has produced, in these pilot plans, and in the "maverick" medical organization, its share of heroes.

The sad chapter of this story is the lack of response by the federal government to these pleas for change.

The federal government has never been a leader in social legislation either within the American context, or compared to other countries. Congress particularly tends to respond with new social legislation only when a problem in health or welfare or education is clearly defined and only after private, local and state alternative actions are demonstrably insufficient.

The same pattern is true in the federal response to training physician's assistants. No one knows how far we could have come today if the Executive Branch had led in a thorough exploration of the whole field of health care, and particularly in freeing the present system from almost exclusive dependency on an underpowered and inefficient use of an inadequate number of doctors.

Today, the Steads, and the Niebauers and the Stokes of American medicine are still finding their way with foundation money, half-hearted federal support, and general skepticism of their medical colleagues.

The federal response, as might be expected, is at least as far behind these leaders as you are. The federal record in stimulating innovation in medical care is a sorry one.

I am working, in those limited ways available to a single Congressman, to hurry this response. You could make an even larger contribution by showing the federal government that you are ready and willing to follow the leaders in the medical schools and not those in the American Medical Association.

⁵ Lewis, Resnik, op. cit.

You can demonstrate, specifically, that physician's assistants should be training today in the medical schools of this country. The medical schools have the knowledge, the faculty and the prestige necessary to commit to the difficult task of deciding which specialties can benefit first and most from physician's assistants.

You have the influence over state accrediting and licensing authorities necessary to get physician's assistants accepted. And you have the knowledge to know where and how, and with what limits, these assistants could be used.

Let me close by saying that Congress is becoming aware of the relation between poverty and medical care. We hear more often from doctors, among others, that the sick get poorer and the poor, sicker. With the present momentum behind our belated commitment to the poor, we could not ignore even if we wanted to, the medical needs of America's forgotten man—the poor, black who causes no riots, who commits no crime, whose only desires are a decent home, a meaningful job, and education to perform it properly.

This forgotten man has been remembered today.

When Shakespeare wrote:

"The miserable have no other medicine. But only hope," he wrote for us.

Let us fulfill that hope together.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BEFORE THE HARTFORD FOUNDATION CONFERENCE ON MEDIA RESEARCH AND MEDICAL TEACHING, N.Y.U. SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, MAY 16, 1968

Medical communication is our theme today. We have seen and heard of many coming marvels of technology, most of which I'll never understand. But I want to talk to you, not about the new technology but about a much older and much more difficult problem of communications:

How does one group in society tell its story and its problem to the public without demeaning its cause or forsaking its integrity? How, specifically, can the medical profession, including its educators, tell the country how desperately serious are today's problems of sustaining and expanding medical education?

After some six years in Congress, you can be sure I am not easily shocked by anything. But I am genuinely and deeply shocked by the possibility that 12 to 15 of this country's medical schools may go out of business in a year or two from lack of funds.

I am shocked, and distressed, that a country that can give General Motors \$20 Million extra to speed up rifle production cannot find a quarter of that amount to keep the have-not medical schools alive.

I am distressed that when Congress authorizes \$90 million for institutional aid to medical schools, the Administration asks for only \$76 million.

And I am as aware as you are, that the fiscal blackmail which may force further budget reductions in order to pass a tax increase, may well fall again on this scanty \$76 million for institutional grants.

But more than exposing our deficiencies in Washington, which I am sure are well known to all of you, I'd like to consider yours also.

I would like to know why, for example, the medical educators have not realistically appraised the problem of the dozen financially weak medical schools, and said: Let's meet and plan a program to communicate this problem to the country. Let us set an example of honesty by listing these have-not schools, by explaining how they got that way, and what we see as solutions.

This is not a difficult story to tell. And, more important, it is not a one-sided story of Federal righteousness, on one side, and educational mismanagement, on the other.

Rather, the poorest dozen medical schools, who are in real danger of collapse without emergency resuscitation, got that way during a decade when the Federal government was raising its medical research budget from \$400 million to \$1.4 billion each year. Much of this money went to the medical schools and some of it goes to the very schools which reel closer and closer to disaster.

But this money, as you well know, does not make a medical school rich. In fact, Federal research funds cost a school part of its own budget in most cases. So the rich schools became poorer, and the poor ones became poorer, but the rich ones survive, because of endowments and wealthy alumni.

You could tell this story better than I, but you haven't done it. You could name a dozen have-not medical schools today. So could I.

Together we could, and should, direct the attention of my colleagues in Congress and yours in these needy medical schools to these facts:

If we lose one of these medical schools—and we may well lose more than one—it will cost \$40-\$50 million in start-up costs for a replacement medical school. It will cost about \$2.5 million each year for that new school just for minimum operating costs. And it will be ten years, and \$75 million later, before the first graduates of that school go into practice.

Meanwhile, during that planning and start up period which takes a decade, one thousand doctors will never be graduated from the school that died. And the 800,000 people they would serve will either go without medical care or become a burden on the limited number of doctors we have.

This is a decade when we finally begin to realize that our medical care system is over-rated, discriminatory and unfair in many ways. Yet we stand unprepared and unorganized to prevent the loss of a dozen overworked medical schools and it is these schools, and you, the educators, who must give us both the answers to our medical care problems and the health manpower to apply them.

I have been critical of our medical care system. I think we must all reexamine many of the premises of today's care system: the sanctity of the private practice of medicine, the devotion to fee-for-service compensation, the reluctance to direct medical services except by the narrower economics of supply and demand, and the live-if-you-can medical treatment given the poor, the ignorant and the Negro.

But I am ready to translate this indictment of shortcomings into support for the efforts the medical school make to save their sister institutions. I am ready to help save the system in order to improve it.

I am ready to help educate my colleagues in Congress and my constituents in this City with these facts:

For what we spend on one fighter-bomber, lost over Vietnam, we can sustain the hard-core of the have-not medical schools.

For the \$2.3 million health program in Laos sponsored by our foreign aid program, we could keep five of our medical schools alive for a year.

And for the \$761,000 we spend on contraceptives in Thailand's share of our foreign medical aid, we could keep Creighton and New York Medical College going for another school year.

How does the richest nation in this world tolerate this situation? The same way we tolerate the poor around us and the crumbling cities in which we live.

Beyond the emergency programs we need during this Congress for the Meharry's and the Marquettes, we need a vastly increased Federal program to create new medical schools and to staff them with new teachers of science and clinical skills.

These new medical schools need not re-

quire completely new building complexes for our medical schools have an average of over three hospital affiliations each. At least 50 of the over 300 teaching hospitals can be detached from their present affiliations to serve as nuclei of new medical schools.

In addition, if every existing medical school expanded its enrollment by five percent we would have almost 400 additional medical graduates a year—the output of nearly four average medical schools. Such expansion involves a minimum of new construction funds and a much faster way of making new doctors.

We must also increase the number of teaching hospitals to bring the benefits of university medical standards to the widest number of our citizens. There is no reason why medical schools cannot extend their affiliation to hospitals hundreds of miles away, considering the ease of transportation and communication today. This radiation of medical competence and performance must be accelerated by expanded federal assistance programs to both the medical schools and to upgrade their potential teaching hospitals.

I have proposed basic science faculty fellowships and clinical teaching grants to staff the new medical schools and to expand enrollment at existing schools.

The present research support of medical college personnel by the federal government is helping to create research faculty members for tomorrow's medical schools. We must also provide an increased flow of clinical teachers of medicine if we are to insure quality medical education for the new and existing schools. To do this, we should encourage specialists on the staffs of leading voluntary institutions to teach medical students in the crucial clinical third and fourth years of medical education.

The total cost of a clinical grant program would be about \$60 million a year. It would provide 1,000 clinical instructors, 1,000 part-time clinical teachers, and 1,000 full-time clinical teachers.

Basic Science Faculty Fellowships would help create the 4,000 additional MD's and PhD's needed to teach in the new medical schools. Five hundred of these teaching candidates would enter the fellowship program each year under full federal grants. Acceptance of the fellowship would pledge the fellows to serve as basic science teachers in a medical school for a specified period following their training.

Another important area to be explored is the creation of new types of health professionals.

There is considerable ferment in the medical profession concerning a new class of doctors' assistants who can relieve them of much of the burden of routine tasks. They would work under close supervision of physicians. Several exciting experiments in training and using such workers have already been conducted with very impressive results.

The federal government, which should lead in encouraging such imaginative uses of new health workers has done just the opposite. It has answered calls for imagination with inertia. For fear of opposition among organized medicine, it has felt safer in doing nothing. For lack of clear legislative mandate, it turns away medicine's own plans to explore the new health assistants.

Communications technology has vast import in manpower training. Media such as films, videotapes, and television systems and computers can vastly extend the didactic output of the single academician . . . immensely relevant when one considers that in 1967 the ratio between teacher and clinical medical student had become 1.2 teachers for every student. This is an unaffordable luxury.

But the broader communications between doctor and the public, between medicine and the Federal government, and between the medical schools and the Congressmen who

represent these schools in their districts, remain my principal concern today.

Fifteen Congressmen, on the floor of the House of Representatives, could explain easily . . . more easily than I have attempted to do . . . how the death of their medical schools will affect their communities. The rest of us can explain and amplify the national concern.

The pork-barrel is always in poor repute. But the Congress continues to respond to the concern of a Congressman about his district. My concern is that these Congressmen don't know the real danger and therefore can't respond properly to it.

My message to you today is that unless the Congress leads in the reconsideration of medical school support, and unless it does it soon, we may be talking here next year about how we can replace the darkened schools.

I do not want to make that speech next year.

THEATER FOR THE FORGOTTEN— A CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Theater for the Forgotten, an organization located in my district, seems to be the only program in the country providing professional entertainment for prisoners and also the opportunity, by participation, for constructive rehabilitative involvement.

My colleagues who have supported the program for the arts and humanities because of its great potential for the cultural life of this country, will recognize that those who are incarcerated will hunger all the more for the opportunity to view a theater program and partake in such a performance. The therapy involved can be of great benefit in helping to restore the individuals involved for return to society.

I have asked Barry H. Garfinkel, Esq., of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, Esqs., in my district, to prepare a short statement about this endeavor which is financed by tax-deductible public contributions.

I know my colleagues will be interested in this, as well as in the New York Times' coverage, one of the many newspaper references to Theater for the Forgotten, and the laudatory letter from New York City Commissioner of Correction George F. McGrath:

THEATER FOR THE FORGOTTEN

HISTORY

Theater for the Forgotten is a 1967, New York State chartered non-profit corporation. Endorsed by New York City and State correction officials, the project has been supported by individual contributions and grants from the J. M. Kaplan Fund and the New York Foundation. The City has provided the 15-member company with a temporary rehearsal building at a rental of \$1 a month. Actors' Equity Association has allowed Theater for the Forgotten to use professional performers without compensating them.

Productions have been brought to Riker's Island, Hart's Island, the Bronx House of Detention for Men and the Women's House of Detention. Although the basic company is composed of professional performers and technicians, prisoners are used also. This is the only program in the country providing

both professional entertainment to the prisoners and the opportunity for constructive rehabilitative involvement. During the past season, Theatre for the Forgotten performed to approximately 6,000 prisoners. One hundred inmates of Riker's Island and the Women's House of Detention actively participated as actors and technicians.

Plays presented include:

"Hello Out There"—Saroyan.

"Lou Gehrig Did Not Die of Cancer"—Jason Miller.

"The Advocate"—Robert Noah.

"The Case of the Crushed Petunias"—Tennessee Williams.

"Here We Are"—Dorothy Parker.

"Impromptu"—Tad Mosel.

"The Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet"—Shaw.

PURPOSE OF EXPANDED PROGRAM

To provide paid employment for ex-convicts and a means to reinforce the rehabilitative study program by creating a "bridge to society";

To stimulate the use of theatre as a rehabilitative tool and encourage the development of prison drama groups;

To increase touring capacities and reach statewide prison audiences.

THE PROGRAM

Theater for the Forgotten is an important cultural enrichment program for the prisons. It provides audiences with an excellent source of professional entertainment; it allows interested prisoners to explore their own potential and receive training. The skills and disciplines acquired by the better motivated prisoners may lead to career opportunities and advancement in theatre and related fields.

APPRENTICE PROJECT

An apprentice program for ex-convicts would allow them to continue their studies, while being salaried. Two former prisoners, introduced to Theater for the Forgotten through the Riker's Island program, have been working with the company as volunteers, since their release.

The project bridges their return to society by providing a positive alternative to a return to former patterns of behavior and unsatisfactory relationships. Working as apprentices they would serve as actors, technicians, designers and administrative assistants. Learning by working, they would become professional.

RIKER'S ISLAND RESIDENT COMPANY

Prison officials have indicated that a permanent professional company at Riker's Island is needed. The communication between prisoners and Theater for the Forgotten staff members enables the company to effectively teach and personally influence the prisoners.

The company of seven (a Director, Stage Manager, Lighting Designer, Scenic Designer and three Actors) would work with 100 prisoners in workshop and production to provide a constructive, therapeutic study program for the enrollees and entertainment for an audience of 3,500. The most promising, and interested, of the students would be referred to the Apprentice Project after their release.

EXPANDED TOURING PROGRAM

Funding would enable Theater for the Forgotten to salary the artists and technicians participating in the program. The company have had to support themselves and the project by working at other jobs. Consequently, rehearsals, performances, and the teaching of prisoners, have been sandwiched into limited time periods.

A company of seven professions and five apprentices would prepare a new production every six weeks and return regularly to all participating institutions. The program in New York City could be expanded to include residences sponsored by the New York State Division for Youth and the State Narcotics

Control Commission. They would also act as consultants to the prisons so that they could institute their own resident work-study programs.

PROJECTED PROGRAM

1968-69 season

Apprentice Project—Five paid Apprentices working full-time with the professional touring company in workshop and on productions.

Riker's Island Resident Company—Seven full-time artists and technicians working in workshop and on productions with only Riker's Island inmates.

Touring Company—A new production would be mounted every six weeks to be toured in the New York City prisons, Narcotics and Division for Youth centers; the company would also perform at Riker's Island.

In addition to the in-prison tours, the apprentices and professionals could make public presentations. The sale of tickets at these performances would help support the project, as well as educate the public to the value of the program.

1969-70 season

Apprentice Project—Five new apprentices would be added to the program.

Riker's Island Resident Company—Expansion of the project as determined by the prison and company needs.

Touring Company—Two companies would be formed made up of the professionals and the experienced apprentices.

The Tour would be expanded to include prisons throughout New York State.

Budgets (One Year)

Administrative budget-----	\$29,510
Apprentice project/one touring company-----	92,725
Riker's Island resident company----	60,381
Total -----	182,616

[From the New York Times, Oct. 15, 1967]

RIKERS' INMATES TURN INTO ACTORS—PLAY AGAINST INJUSTICE IS PERFORMED BY PRISONERS

(By J. Anthony Lukas)

When the lights went on after the first act of "The Advocate" Monday night, a heavyset man in the first row rose quickly and lumbered backstage to examine a ring of keys used to unlock Bartolomeo Vanzetti's cell.

"Theatrical realism is fine," said Jim Thomas, "but those keys looked a little too real."

Mr. Thomas' concern was understandable. He is the warden of the New York City Correctional Institution for Men and the play was being presented in the institution's auditorium on Rikers Island. The man who played Vanzetti's guard—like 22 of the other actors—was a prisoner.

The play, presented at the prison Monday through Friday, made both theatrical and penal history: this is believed to be the first time professional actor and prisoners had combined efforts in a theatrical production.

From City Correction Commissioner George F. McGrath, who authorized the unusual venture, down to the guards and prisoners on Rikers Island, everyone associated with the project was eager to see that nothing went wrong.

ONE WATCH STOLEN

Except for a stop watch stolen from the prop manager's cupboard, a sprained ankle suffered by the stage manager when his foot caught under a piece of scenery and a power failure on Wednesday, nothing did go wrong. In fact, things went so well that prison officials have invited the producers to return again soon for another production.

The producers are the Theater for the Forgotten, Inc., a group of young professional actors who got together last spring to tour penal institutions.

Its first productions—a pair of one-act plays—were presented last June at Rikers Island and at the Women's House of Detention. But in both cases the cast and the production crew were fully professional.

The reaction at Rikers Island, where many of the prisoners had never seen a play before, was so enthusiastic that the producers decided to try involving the prisoners in their next production.

Moreover, they chose a play with which the prisoners could identify but which was hardly calculated to enchant prison authorities: "The Advocate," a play by Robert Noah about the Sacco-Vanzetti trial of the twenties.

The play argues that Bartolomeo Vanzetti, a shoemaker, and Nicola Sacco, a fish peddler, were not guilty of the South Braintree payroll robbery and murder for which they were executed in 1927 and that their conviction and execution resulted largely from prejudice against them as anarchists.

Commissioner McGrath, who attended Monday's performance, said he had not wasted much thought about this.

"I realized that the prisoners might tend to sympathize with Sacco and Vanzetti and therefore be critical of the system which sent them to their deaths, but that's perfectly O.K. We all know that there are injustices. They're thinking people and they can make up their minds."

The audience at Monday night's performance—about 600 adolescents (16 to 21) from the Rikers Island Reformatory—clearly did sympathize with the prisoners. They cheered when Sacco, as played by one of the group's founders, Akila Coulumbis, spat at his guard.

When Sacco and Vanzetti's lawyer asked: "Do they have to trace their ancestry back to the God damned Mayflower?", the prisoners cheered and laughed and one Negro boy chortled with glee "the God Damned Mayflower!"

Steve R., a tall, quiet prisoner, said, "some parts of it I didn't like. Like that scene where the lawyer accused the Italian fellow of lying. I don't like my lawyer to call me a liar. I want him to believe me and then decide what he wants to tell the court. He shouldn't call me a liar."

However, the greatest impact has been made on the 23 inmate-actors and the roughly equal number of inmate-stage hands.

Originally, there were only a few parts that could have been assigned to prisoners but John Sillings, the director; Mr. Coulumbis, a 35-year-old actor and part-time taxi driver, and the co-founder, a 28-year-old actress named Beverley Rich wrote about 23 extra parts into the play—extra guards, wardens, newspaper reporters, spectators—so all the inmates who wanted to act could do so.

OFFICE OF THE
COMMISSIONER OF CORRECTION,
New York, N.Y., March 12, 1968.

Mr. AKILA COULUMBIS,
President, Theater for the Forgotten,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. COULUMBIS: On behalf of the New York City Department of Correction, may I again express our profound gratitude to you and your fellow members of the Theater for the Forgotten for the excellent volunteer dramatic productions presented in our various correctional institutions this season.

Especially germane to our aims in Correctional Rehabilitation has been the involvement of inmates in the various preparatory, technical, and performance phases of the repertory theater sponsored by your Theater for the Forgotten Workshop. We especially appreciate your generous contributions of time and talent in thus encouraging active participation of our prisoners

in your fine presentations of superior dramatic works.

Your plays have brought great enjoyment to both Staff and inmates. For the latter, however, perhaps the greatest enjoyment lies in the thought that, by bringing this bit of the outside community to them inside the prison walls, you demonstrate that after all they are not forgotten. Please also extend my personal thanks to the Vice-President of your organization, Miss Beverly Rich, for her untiring creative efforts on behalf of this project, and to each individual member of your versatile company of actors, writers, directors, and lighting and stage technicians.

With every good wish for your continued success.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE F. MCGRATH,
Commissioner.

ONLY 14 MORE DAYS TO GO

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3, I inserted remarks concerning the issue of the mutilation of documents in the now famous Otto Otepka case. Briefly, the State Department accused Otepka of mutilating various documents which is a Federal offense under title 18, United States Code, section 2071. Otepka denied the charge and sought to have this issue aired before the Civil Service Commission with a view to exposing the actual perpetrators. The Commission ruled that only the first three charges made by State against Otepka—these did not include the mutilation charges—would be subject to review by CSC.

It is indeed ironic that the mutilation offense has been allowed to go unresolved for almost 5 years now. In fact, June 18 of this month, as I understand the case, will mark the end of 5 years, within which time the violators can be prosecuted. After this date, the 5-year statute of limitations will have expired and those responsible can no longer be tried. Only 14 more days to go.

From my acquaintance with the mutilation aspects of the Otepka case, all evidence points to a complete fraud on the part of State Department officials. The FBI was called in on the case in July 1963, and if the evidence pointed to Otepka as the offender, why were not charges referred to the Justice Department for prosecution? Why were these charges dropped just before the hearings got underway in late 1967, when Otepka would have an opportunity to question certain persons who were close to the case? Why is Otepka so anxious to fumigate this whole issue by means of an investigation?

Is it any wonder that hundreds of editorials and articles throughout the country have been written protesting the State Department role in this case. The Cincinnati Enquirer on May 28 ran an editorial which, I think, is typical of the resentment which has been generated by the Otepka case. I insert the editorial,

"The Otepka Drama Thickens," in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, May 28, 1968]

THE OTEPKA DRAMA THICKENS

One of these years, it is devoutly to be hoped, the public of the United States will be able to follow the ugly tracery of the State Department's seeming vendetta against one of its top security officers—Otto F. Otepka.

We say "years," because years it may be. The Civil Service Commission has just upheld the demotion of Mr. Otepka to a sort of card-shuffling routine job that was, quite frankly, given him to prevent his great talent as a security officer from being put to good use.

At the present time, it is just about as difficult for Communists to get into the United States as it is for salmon to go back to the headwaters of the Columbia River—and a fish ladder was built alongside the dam for their special convenience.

Mr. Otepka's talent was rated very high in Washington until he began to inquire into the procedure of giving automatic clearance on an emergency or temporary basis to State Department personnel and others. It was his suggestion that such people should be checked later, as a matter of security, that started his downfall. When it was demonstrated that one of the opponents of a check was doing a bit of lying, the old State Department esprit de corps was challenged—and Mr. Otepka took it on the chin. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee talked to Mr. Otepka (who said "Hello" first is really immaterial) and that did it. He was suspended and relieved of his duties, for "giving security information" to this high senatorial committee.

Later he was fired, then rehired in an obscure administrative job. He appealed, and the Civil Service Commission has just confirmed the demotion. He now may appeal his case to the commission's Board of Appeals and Review.

The record has to be straightened out by this or a subsequent administration. From the outset of the matter, the State Department's attitude on the security matter has been very redolent of the old joke: "Ain't nobody here but us chickens."

WAR PROMOTED BY U.N. IMPERIALISTS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, parroting the racist "antiwhite" line of the Red-black power bloc, the United Nations continues its revolutionary conspiracy to attack and blockade peaceful free nations that do not succumb to its power politicians—the U.N. feudal state of forced colonialism.

Sounding like the Kerner report, in this year of international human rights celebrations, the U.N. dictated a role of aggression to all countries to author and prosecute organizations "disseminating propaganda for nazism, the police of apartheid, and other forms of racial intolerance."

By its own resolve, the U.N. Economic and Social Council indicted itself. No organization in the world has proven more racist and Nazi dictator-like than the U.N. and its Red tribal leaders.

This must go down in history as a tremendous vote of confidence—a victory for Rhodesia and Prime Minister Ian Smith. They must present a nonviolent threat to the Bolshevik takeover apparatus.

And what did the representatives of our great U.S. Government do? We abstained.

There is only one thing worse than having no vote and that is having a vote but lacking the courage to cast it. Why should the United States remain in the U.N. if we are not going to participate or vote? Merely to pay dues?

And the poor British who introduced the resolution and then abstained in voting do not seem aware that these same Red-black fiends of the U.N. have already started the movement to overthrow the English language as a "racist" language. Anti-American—anti-English appears the fancy of the hour.

Under unanimous consent I submit the AP and UPI releases of May 30 and June 1 for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, May 30, 1968]

U.N. BEGINS RHODESIA TRADE BAN

UNITED NATIONS (UPI).—The Security Council Wednesday night unanimously imposed a total trade ban on white minority-ruled Rhodesia. It was the first such step in United Nations history.

The 15-member council gave its backing to a compromise resolution imposing a complete trade embargo on Rhodesia with the exception of medicines, news material and educational materials.

The resolution recommends that governments discourage emigration to Rhodesia and close down any remaining consulates there.

NO INVESTING

It bans all investments in Rhodesia and payments to the Salisbury regime of Premier Ian Smith with the exception of humanitarian needs, such as pensions.

The 5½-page resolution was drawn up in weeks of behind-the-scenes talks between British Ambassador Lord Caradon and the five Afro-Asian members of the council.

It calls on governments to prevent their airlines from flying to Rhodesia or to link up with any other airline operating out of the southern Africa country that declared independence from Britain in November 1965. London never has recognized Smith's government.

The resolution calls for a ban on travel abroad by holders of Rhodesian passports, regardless of their date of issue. The ban was applicable especially to those persons suspected of promoting the cause of what the United Nations has termed the "illegal" regime of Smith.

DEMANDS DROPPED

The five Afro-Asian nations—Algeria, Ethiopia, India, Pakistan and Senegal—had dropped their long-standing demands for the use of force by Britain or the United Nations to topple Smith.

They also withdrew demands to have Portugal and South Africa singled out as the two main countries which had continued trading with Rhodesia despite the imposition of partial mandatory sanctions 18 months ago.

Despite the partial sanctions, Rhodesia claimed it was weathering the crackdown well, particularly with help from neighboring white-ruled South Africa's "open-door" policy.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate, June 1, 1968]

U.N. COUNCIL URGES ACTION AGAINST RACISM

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y. (AP).—The U.N. Economic and Social Council recommended Friday night that the General Assembly call upon all countries to outlaw and prosecute organizations "disseminating propaganda for Nazism, the policy of apartheid and other forms of racial intolerance."

The council acted by a vote of 25-0 with the United States and Britain abstaining. The action stemmed from a debate in the council's social committee in which speakers condemned South African apartheid, or racial segregation, and described the West German National Democratic Party as neo-Nazi. The party has denied such charges.

Ending its 25-day, 44th semiannual session, the council also recommended that the assembly adopt a resolution calling upon countries to break off all relations with South Africa and Rhodesia, Britain's former African colony ruled by a white minority government.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 30, 1968]

U.N. COUNCIL VOTES TIGHT BAN ON RHODESIA

UNITED NATIONS (UPI).—Backers of a U.N. trade ban that would cripple the economy of white-ruled Rhodesia if enforced began today the formidable task of making it work.

The ban, approved yesterday by the Security Council, must win the support of a substantial number of national legislative bodies before it can have any effect on Rhodesia. Diplomatic observers said the support would be slow in coming from many nations, notably Portugal and South Africa.

The Security Council action calls for U.N. member nations to end all imports and exports with Rhodesia except for medicine, news and educational materials; to bar Rhodesian passport holders from their borders; to sever all air links with Rhodesia and to halt all investment in the Rhodesian economy.

The resolution, sponsored by Britain, and passed unanimously, calls on all members to report by Aug. 1, 1968, on what they have done about applying the ban.

Britain sought the worldwide boycott as a means of toppling the regime of Premier Ian Smith who declared his nation independent of British colonial rule in 1965.

The break came over British plans for giving Rhodesia's black majority control of the government and eventual independence.

THE 120TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago has published an excellent advertisement recognizing the 120th anniversary of the Chicago Board of Trade.

This advertisement underscores a firm conviction, as stated by Mr. James D. Walsh, vice president of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., that the entire agricultural economy of the United States would slow down considerably if the Chicago Board of Trade and

similar exchanges in Minneapolis and Kansas City did not provide the facilities for dealing in commodities.

At the conclusion of this ad I am inserting a letter from Mr. Walsh, which I think dramatically describes the impact of the Chicago Board of Trade on our Nation's entire economy.

I am sure my colleagues will read with interest the information provided by the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago.

The ad and Mr. Walsh's letter follow:

KARL MARX AND THE CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE
HAVE ONLY ONE THING IN COMMON

The year, 1848.

It was the year Karl Marx published the Communist Manifesto.

It was also the year the Chicago Board of Trade was founded. But that's where the similarity ends.

Karl Marx went on to do as much as he could to destroy the market economy. The Chicago Board of Trade was formed to make the market economy work even better.

And it's done just that.

For 120 years now, the Chicago Board of Trade has offered a competitive, open market for our basic commodities.

By doing so, this organization has helped the farmer plan his crop. The food processor plan his production. The consumer plan his budget.

So Happy 120th Anniversary, today, Chicago Board of Trade from your neighbor across the street. Your neighbor, who also feels pretty strongly about our market economy.

CONTINENTAL ILLINOIS NATIONAL BANK
& TRUST CO. OF CHICAGO.

CONTINENTAL ILLINOIS NATIONAL
BANK & TRUST CO. OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., May 27, 1968.

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PUCINSKI: Perhaps you might be interested in seeing a reprint of our advertisement recognizing the 120th anniversary of the Chicago Board of Trade. The ad underscores a firm conviction of ours, which is that the entire agricultural economy of the country would slow down considerably if the Chicago Board of Trade and similar exchanges in Kansas City and Minneapolis did not provide the facilities for a country elevator operator, grain merchant, processor, or exporter to hedge the cost of his inventory and his forward purchases and sales. Certainly, inventory accumulation would be at a much lower rate. If such futures markets did not exist, a similar hedging or price insuring mechanism would necessarily evolve, or the flow of grain from the farmer to the ultimate consumer would be seriously affected.

One facet of the importance of a vital grain industry should be noted: In 1967 Illinois sold over two and one-half billion dollars worth of goods overseas and ranked as the nation's number-one exporting state. Three-quarters of a billion dollars of that total came from agricultural exports—10 per cent of the approximately eight-billion-dollar total of all U.S. agricultural exports. This kind of aggressive export marketing is important to our unfavorable balance of payments position.

You are of course familiar with these facts and their relevance to the economy and our national interest, but they are well worth re-emphasizing in the light of many legislative decisions you are called upon to make during a session. Thank you for your continuing vigilance.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. WALSH.

THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT IS NECESSARY

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 4, 1968

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in proposing the Trade Expansion Act of 1968, President Johnson has asked for the basic tools to, first, insure that our trade relations with other countries will be strengthened on a rational, cooperative basis; second, achieve the full promise of the Kennedy round trade negotiation for American exporters and consumers; and, third, insure that any burdens arising from our trade policies do not fall un-

fairly on any one segment of the population.

For three decades the United States has successfully led the world toward an increasingly open and liberal trade system. The future of the U.S. economy is intimately tied to our own trade policies and those of our major trading partners. Our progressive trading relations have become the lifeblood of the pattern of interdependence which has developed among the industrialized countries and particularly in the partnership between the United States and Europe.

European countries are in the process of developing a unified market that may one day approach, if not equal, that of the United States. The European Common Market is already the world's larg-

est trading unit. Its completion this summer will open the prospect of a rapidly growing single market for U.S. products. Our steady adherence to constructive policies are of vital importance if we are to take advantage of these opportunities.

In the Kennedy round, the United States, Europe, Japan, Canada, and other major trading countries gave convincing evidence that they were more than ever united by the bonds of international trade. We must now reaffirm our commitment to trade expansion and to the policies that will keep our trade relations on an even keel.

The Trade Expansion Act of 1968 will accomplish their objectives and I urge support for this vital bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, June 5, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Kurt L. Metzger, Temple B'nai Israel, Olean, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

It hath been shown thee, O man, what is good, and what the Lord doth require of thee; to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.—Micah 6: 8.

Our God, creator and ruler of all men, we pray Thee this day for our Nation that with Thy gracious help and our concerted efforts all hatred and malice, all indifference to the suffering of others, all narrow exclusiveness and selfish greed may speedily cease in our land.

Grant that the spirit of justice and love for our fellowmen, cooperation in service, and self-sacrifice for the welfare of all may ever increase among our people. In this hour of shock over the wounding of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY we beseech Thee to bestow upon him complete recovery from his injuries and to restore him to our country and to his family in renewed health and vigor. Cause, O God, the evils of violence to cease from the earth and the spirit of brotherhood and understanding to enter the minds and hearts of all men.

We also pray for ourselves that Thy hand forge us into tools for the service of our country. Help us to be among those who are willing to sweep away oppression and wrong, to uplift the weak and to give to every man, regardless of color or creed, the opportunity of a full life to be lived for Thy glory and for the service of mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 752. An act to amend sections 203(b) (5) and 220 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the cruel shooting down of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY has shocked the world and brought to all decent people heartfelt sympathy for him and his wonderful family. Some will probably say that this outrageous crime was the result of a divisive and troubled society. I do not know. Certainly this assault was due to the fact that a demented person had a loaded gun which he had no business having. Making America safe has become a major responsibility of every right-thinking person in our land.

I applaud President Johnson's plan to provide Secret Service protection to presidential candidates much as I regret that in our country, renowned for assuring free expression and movement to all, it should be necessary to protect those who campaign for this high public office, as well as those who hold it.

Our hearts go out to the Kennedy family, one of the most dynamic families of this generation and a family that has been the victim of so many tragedies that their burden seems at times to be unbearable.

I pray for Senator KENNEDY's recovery and for the courage and comfort of his family during their ordeal, as well as for all others who were shot during his attempted assassination.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished majority leader in his expression of prayer for Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, for the Senator's family and for the Nation.

It is typical of Senator KENNEDY that among the last words he spoke before he was cut down by the assailant's bullets were spoken so movingly and eloquently:

We are a great country. We are an unselfish people. We are a compassionate country.

These words—words that sum up Senator KENNEDY's profound and abiding faith in the United States—are the same as those often spoken by our late

beloved President John F. Kennedy and repeated by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

The adjectives great, unselfish, and compassionate are the hallmarks of the Kennedy family itself as well as of the Nation. The Kennedys have given these attributes in abundance to the United States. They have, indeed, given of their lives and fortune to keep this country great.

As the majority leader has indicated, the Kennedy family is magnanimous and magnificent. Few families have borne such dreadful tragedy and still continued to give their brilliance, industry, and talent to the public service of the United States.

I know the great sorrow and shock that wells in this House of Representatives today—on both sides of the political aisle.

As one who is close to the Kennedy family, I extend my deep sympathy to them in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the country is shocked at what happened in the early morning hours of this morning in the brutal and evil assault upon one of our most distinguished Americans and outstanding legislators.

I join with the majority leader in his remarks. We all hope and pray that God will look with favor upon Senator KENNEDY and bring about a complete recovery.

Every Member of this body is joined in extending to Senator and Mrs. Kennedy and children, and the Senator's parents and other loved ones, our deep feelings of sympathy and regret for the unexpected action that took place resulting in serious injuries to Senator KENNEDY. What has happened is all the more dramatic following the tragic death of the Senator's late brother, President John F. Kennedy. At that time I made the immediate observation, "My God, what are we coming to?" And that same observation applies to the evil, vicious, and dastardly assault upon Senator ROBERT KENNEDY.